



AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION RIVERSIDE COUNTY AGENDA

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

Thursday 9:00 a.m., November 12, 2009

CHAIR
Simon Housman
Rancho Mirage

VICE CHAIRMAN
Rod Ballance
Riverside

COMMISSIONERS

Arthur Butler
Riverside

Robin Lowe
Hemet

John Lyon
Riverside

Glen Holmes
Hemet

Melanie Fesmire
Indio

STAFF

Director
Ed Cooper

John Guerin
Brenda Ramirez
Barbara Santos

County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon St., 9th Floor.
Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 955-5132

www.rcaluc.org

NOTE: If you wish to speak, please complete a "SPEAKER IDENTIFICATION FORM" and give it to the Secretary. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow interested parties to express their concerns. Comments shall be limited to 5 minutes and to matters relevant to the item under consideration. Please do not repeat information already given. If you have no additional information, but wish to be on record, simply give your name and address and state that you agree with the previous speaker(s). Also please be aware that the indicated staff recommendation shown below may differ from that presented to the Commission during the public hearing.

Non-exempt materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Airport Land Use Commission or its staff after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Airport Land Use Commission's office located at 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501 during normal business hours.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if any accommodations are needed, please contact Barbara Santos at (951) 955-5132 or E-mail at basantos@rctlma.org. Request should be made at least 48 hours or as soon as possible prior to the scheduled meeting.

1.0 INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 CALL TO ORDER

1.2 SALUTE TO FLAG

1.3 ROLL CALL

2.0 PUBLIC HEARING: OLD BUSINESS

PALM SPRINGS INTERNATIONAL

- 2.1 ZAP1006PS09 – Wessman Development Co. (Representative: Palm Springs Unified School District) – City Case No. PA09-003 (Design Review). A proposal for the construction of an approximately 79,670 square foot district service center that will consist of a food service, storage, warehouse space, reprographics, and maintenance shop, on 12.3-acres of a 20-acre site, within the City of Palm Springs, located easterly of Gene Autry Trail, westerly of San Joaquin Drive, and northerly of Mission Drive, approximately 1,303 feet easterly of Runway 13L-31R at Palm Springs International Airport. The Palm Springs Unified School District has no current plans for the remaining 7.7 acres. The project site is located within Compatibility Zone C and partially within Compatibility Zone D. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY

BANNING AIRPORT

- 2.2 ZAP1005BA09 – Inland Behavioral & Health Services, Inc (Representative: Joseph E. Bonadiman & Associates, Inc.) – City Case No. CUP 09-803 (Conditional Use Permit). A proposal for the development of a 9,000 square foot medical and dental clinic with a future 6,000 square foot second floor to be added, on a 1.3 gross acre site, within the City of Banning, located southerly of Ramsey Street, westerly of Val Monte Street, and northerly of Interstate 10 freeway, approximately 1,746 feet northwesterly of the westerly runway at Banning Municipal Airport. The project site is located within Compatibility Zone C of the Banning Municipal Airport. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin, Ph: (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY

3.0 PUBLIC HEARING: NEW BUSINESS**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

- 3.1 ZAP1038BD09 – Desert Storage Masters, LLC/T-Mobile (Representative: Monica Moretta) – City Case No.: CUP 09-6-940 (Conditional Use Permit). Development of an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 70-foot high monopalm, equipment cabinets, GPS antenna, and microwave dish antenna with a 675.5 square foot lease area on an 8-acre site used for mini-storage and vehicle storage located southerly of Indio Boulevard and the southerly terminus of Madiso Street, westerly of Madison Street, and northerly of Foxglove Lane, in the City of Indio. Airport Compatibility Zones B1 and C. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

- 3.2 ZAP1039BD09 – Grinnell Properties LLC/The Academy Firing Range (Representative: Marsha Vincelette) – County Case No. CUP 03630 (Conditional Use Permit). A proposal to establish a 28-lane, indoor firing range and a security academy within two existing buildings (each approximately 19,800 square feet in floor area) located at 39698A and 39698B El Viento Road, southerly of Flora Road and northerly of Las Montanas Road, within Desert Business Park. The business park is located northerly of Interstate 10 and westerly of Washington Street in the unincorporated Riverside County community of Bermuda Dunes. The northerly building, except for one existing occupied suite, will house 14 firing lanes and a security academy that will include tactical training area for law enforcement, 9 offices, and 5 training rooms. The southerly building will be occupied by The Academy Firing Range and include 14 firing lanes, a 2,750-square foot uniform supply and fitting area, a gun sales area, 9 offices, and 3 training rooms. Airport Compatibility Zone D. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

- 3.3 FV-06-113 – AT&T Mobility/Bechtel/Silverhawk Industrial LP (Representative: Kathy O'Connor-Phelps, Bemis Development/Derra Design) – County Case No. PP21164 (Plot Plan) – Development of an unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 70-foot high monoelm, equipment shelter, and GPS antennas on a 2.68-acre site located at 38340 Innovation Court, northwesterly of the terminus of Innovation Court and northeasterly of Technology Drive, in the unincorporated Riverside County community of French Valley, in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. The total height to the “top of frond” will not exceed 75 feet above ground level. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: INCONSISTENT

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

- 3.4 ZAP1061MA09 – Kimley-Horn and Associates, for LNR Property Corp. (Representative: Scott Barker) – JPA Case No. SP-4 (Specific Plan Amendment): North Campus of the Meridian Specific Plan. A proposal to amend the Meridian Specific Plan (initially called the March Business Center Specific Plan) by: (1) changing the acreages designated for various uses-increasing acreages of industrial, commercial, and office uses and reducing acreages of business park, mixed use, and public facility uses; (2) adding 9.7 acres of open space for storm water detention; and (3) specifically providing for two 10,000-gallon above ground diesel fuel storage tanks in the area known as “Lot 16.” The “North Campus” comprises approximately 662 acres located northerly of Van Buren Boulevard, southerly of Alessandro Boulevard and westerly of Interstate 215, within the land use jurisdiction of the March Joint Powers Authority. The amendment affects 256.7 acres within that area. (Airport Areas I and II). ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONSISTENT

NEW HELICOPTER FACILITY

- 3.5 ZAP1062MA09 – Valley Health System/Menifee Valley Medical Center (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners) – City Case No. PUP 2009-68 (Public Use Permit) – A proposal to establish an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Helicopter Landing Site at Menifee Valley Medical Center, a hospital located at 28400 McCall Boulevard in the City of Menifee. The medical center campus is located on the north side of McCall Boulevard, easterly of Antelope Road. The facility will consist of a 48 foot square (2,304 square foot) concrete landing pad with associated gurney ramp and wind cone. The facility will be used only for emergency medical services, departures and landings, including patient transfer to higher level or specialized facilities. These activities have traditionally occurred in the parking lot. Provision for a specified location and a facility that complies with FAA criteria would enhance safety. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONTINUE TO JANUARY 14, 2010

NEW HELICOPTER FACILITY

3.6 ZAP1012FL09 – Riverside Healthcare System/Riverside Community Hospital (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners) – City Case No. P09-0694 (Conditional Use Permit) – A proposal to establish a heliport (specifically, a hospital helistop) atop the top deck of the parking structure at Riverside Community Hospital, located at 4445 Magnolia Avenue in the City of Riverside. The hospital campus is located on the west side of Magnolia Avenue, south of 14th Street, north of Terracina Drive, and east of Brockton Avenue. The facility will consist of a 54-foot square (2,916 square foot) elevated metal landing pad with associated gurney ramp, safety net, wind cone, lighting, and painted markings, and the design will comply with FAA requirements. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or E-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

Staff Recommendation: CONTINUE TO JANUARY 14, 2010

4.0 **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

4.1 2010 Finalized Project Submission Schedule

5.0 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 8, 2009

6.0 **ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA**

7.0 **COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 2.1

HEARING DATE: ~~October 8, 2009~~ **November 12, 2009**

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1006PS09 – Wessman Development Co.
(Representative: Palm Springs Unified School
District)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Palm Springs

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PA09-003 (Design Review)

MAJOR ISSUES: ~~FAA review is required and the applicant is in the process of submitting the project for review. In addition, ALUC staff is still awaiting detailed floor plans, in order to calculate the proposed density pursuant to the California Building Code Method.~~

~~The project is also required to provide a minimum of 0.5 acres of open space in Compatibility Zone D. The project is currently designed in a manner that provides 7.7 acres of vacant land in Compatibility Zone C, with no designated open space located within Compatibility Zone D.~~

None.

RECOMMENDATION: ~~Staff recommends CONTINUANCE to the November 12, 2009 Commission hearing, in order to give the applicant sufficient time to submit required floor plans and FAA review forms.~~

Staff recommends a finding of CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY for the Design Review, subject to the conditions herein and such additional conditions as may be necessary to reflect the determination of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to develop an approximately 79,670 square foot district service center that will consist of a food service (preparation), storage, warehouse space, reprographics, and maintenance shop, on 12.3-acre portion of a 20 acre property.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project site is located easterly of Gene Autry Trail, westerly of San Joaquin Drive, and northerly of Mission Drive, within the City of Palm Springs, approximately 1,305 feet easterly of Runway 13L-31R at Palm Springs International Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: 2005 Palm Springs International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

- a. Airport Influence Area: Palm Springs International Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zones C and D
- c. Noise Levels: Outside the 60 CNEL noise contour

BACKGROUND:

Land Use/Intensity: The project site is located primarily within Compatibility Zone C and partially within Compatibility Zone D. The applicant proposes to develop an approximately 79,670 square foot district service center that will have two buildings that would consist of three departments: maintenance and operations, food services, and a warehouse. The project will develop 12.3 acres of an approximately 20 gross acre site, and leave the remaining 7.7 acres undeveloped.

More specifically, the site includes 12.16 net acres in Compatibility Zone C and 5.41 net acres in Compatibility Zone D. Nonresidential intensity in Compatibility Zone C is restricted to an average intensity of 80 persons and a maximum intensity of 160 persons in any given acre. Nonresidential intensity of Compatibility Zone D is restricted to an average intensity of 100 persons and a maximum of 300 persons in any given acre.

~~Staff has asked the applicant to submit the proposed detail floor plans for the buildings in order to calculate the project's density, per the California Building Code method. As of staff's report, this information has not yet been submitted to us.~~ The applicant estimates that the maintenance and operations division will have approximately 67 employees and 75 district vehicles stored on site. The majority of these employees would arrive on site but leave to various school sites by 6:30 AM. The food service division will have approximately 18 employees and six vehicles stored on site. Lastly, the warehouse division will have approximately 14 employees and five vehicles on site. Therefore, the total number of employees will be 99, per the applicant's calculation.

Staff has analyzed the project, using the California Building Code, and has determined that the total occupancy for the entire project, with the incorporation of the 50% reduction, is approximately 343.7 persons. Therefore, the average intensity would be approximately 17.2 persons per acre (based on the overall 20-acre site). The highest single-acre intensity would be approximately 135.4 people. Both the average and single-acre intensities meet the criteria limit for Compatibility Zone C.

Based on the Parking Calculation Method total occupancy would be estimated at 400.5 persons (1.5 persons per parking spaces), for an average intensity 20 persons per acre for the overall 20 gross acre site.

Part 77: The maximum elevation of the site ranges from 396-408 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The proposed structures will have a height not exceeding 38 feet at top of roof. The elevation of the southerly end of Runway 31R is 404.4 feet AMSL. At a distance of approximately 1,305 feet from Runway 13L-31R, any structure above 417.5 feet AMSL will require FAA review. As the proposed structures would exceed this elevation, FAA review is required.

Form 7460-1 has been submitted, and the FAA has assigned the project an Aeronautical Study Number: 2009-AWP-5146-OE.

Noise: The project is outside the 60 CNEL noise contour. While, the majority of the proposed project uses will not be noise sensitive a minimum noise reduction of 20 dB in office areas is required.

Open Space: Compatibility Zone C requires 20% of major projects be set aside as open land that could potentially serve as emergency landing areas. Compatibility Zone D requires a 10% set aside. Pursuant to Countywide Policy 3.3.5, when evaluating consistency, “any parcel...split by compatibility zone boundaries shall be considered as if it were multiple parcels divided at the compatibility zone boundary line.”

Thus, 2.4 acres of open land are required in Compatibility Zone C and 0.5 acres of open space are required in Compatibility Zone D for a grand total of 2.9 acres of open space. Currently the project has approximately 7.7 acres of vacant land. The applicant has no current plans for the 7.7 acres, and, furthermore, does not expect any plans for more than 10 years. However, the entire 7.7 acres are located within Compatibility Zone C.

CONDITIONS:

1. Any outdoor lighting installed shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.
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 large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, incinerators, and landfills.)
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
 - (e) Children's schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and highly noise-sensitive outdoor nonresidential uses, and, in the structures located partially or wholly in Compatibility Zone C, libraries and day care centers.
3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.
4. Any retention basin shall be designed so as to provide a maximum 48-hour detention period for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the retention basin that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.
5. Prior to the scheduling of the issuance of building permits for the project, the proponent shall ~~file Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, with the Federal Aviation Administration and~~ shall present evidence of a finding of "Not a Hazard to Air Navigation" to Airport Land Use Commission Staff.
6. Noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the design of the office areas of the structure, as necessary to ensure interior noise levels are reduced by a minimum of 20dB from aircraft operations.
7. A minimum of 2.9 acres of open area in as defined by Countywide Policy 4.2.4 of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan shall be provided on-site. Such open areas shall have a minimum width of 75 feet and a minimum length of 300 feet, and shall not be obstructed by walls, trash enclosures, large trees or poles greater than 4 inches in diameter at a height greater than 4 feet, or overhead wires. **Prior to issuance of building permits for any structure, the permittee shall provide copies of the site plan delineating**

the location of qualifying area to remain as permanent open space to both the City of Palm Springs and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 2.2

HEARING DATE: ~~October 8, 2009~~ **November 12, 2009**

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1005BA09 – Inland Behavioral & Health Services, Inc (Representative: Joseph E. Bonadiman & Associates, Inc.)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Banning

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Conditional Use Permit No. 09-803

MAJOR ISSUES: ~~The project site is an approximately 1.3 gross acre site within Compatibility Zone C of the Banning Municipal Airport. The allowable density within Compatibility Zone C is limited to a maximum of 75 persons per average acre. The proposed project, as reflected on the site plan, would allow for a total density of 121 persons on just the first floor, resulting in an average intensity of approximately 93 persons per acre. Staff has been in communications with the applicant and has not resolved this issue. In addition, FAA review is required and, at this time, the applicant has not filed Form 7460-1.~~

None remaining, provided that the project is evaluated as a “health care facility,” rather than on a disaggregated room-by-room basis.

RECOMMENDATION: ~~Staff recommends CONTINUANCE to the November 12, 2009 hearing in order to allow the applicant to file Form 7460-1, and possibly to work out potential intensity issues the project currently poses.~~

Staff recommends a finding of CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY for the Conditional Use Permit, subject to the conditions herein and such additional conditions as may be necessary to reflect the determination of the Federal Aviation Administration.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to develop a 9,000 square foot medical and dental clinic with a future 6,000 square foot second floor to be added.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project is located southerly of Ramsey Street, westerly of Val Monte Street, and northerly of Interstate 10 freeway, in the City of Banning, approximately 1,746 feet northwesterly of the westerly terminus of the runway at Banning Municipal Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: 2004 Banning Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

- a. Airport Influence Area: Banning Municipal Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zone C
- c. Noise Levels: Outside the 55 CNEL contour

BACKGROUND:

Land Use/Intensity: The project site is located within Compatibility Zone C of the Banning Municipal Airport. The project site is approximately 0.95 net acres and approximately 1.3 gross acres. The project is located adjacent to the Interstate 10 corridor and the Southern Pacific Railroad.

The density criterion for Compatibility Zone C allows 75 people per average acre and up to 150 people in any given acre. The project proposes to develop a 9,000 square foot medical and dental clinic (first phase) with a future second floor addition of 6,000 square feet (second phase). While hospitals and nursing homes are prohibited uses in Compatibility Zone C, the applicant's proposed project would be for outpatient treatments; therefore, the proposed use is compatible.

At the October 8, 2009 ALUC hearing the Commissioners allowed staff to determine the maximum concentration of people by applying the "Health-Care Facility" standard of the California Building Code to the entire two-story building.

~~Staff has analyzed the proposed first phase, using the California Building Code, and has determined that the total occupancy for the first phase, with incorporation of 50% reduction, is approximately 121.8 persons. Therefore, even with the use of the gross acreage the average acre intensity would be approximately 93.7 persons, which exceeds the criteria. While the single acre intensity would be met for the first phase, the second phase could make the development inconsistent by exceeding 150 people. The applicant will need to reduce the proposed building in order to meet the density criteria.~~

~~Staff has been in communication with the applicant and has not resolved the density issue. The applicant has stated that they would be willing to put in fixed seating into the waiting areas to decrease the density. The waiting areas, by far, make up the majority of the total density. Staff has calculated that the four waiting areas total approximately 88.1 persons of the entire 121 persons on site. The second phase floor plans were not made~~

~~available to staff and, therefore, staff could not determine the added density that would bring to the overall project. If the entire first and second floors were calculated as~~

Based on the standard intensity of a health-care facility (1 person per 80 square feet), with incorporation of 50% reduction, the total occupancy on site would be approximately 93.7 persons. This ~~would~~ puts the project well below the intensity limit of Compatibility Zone C and makes the project consistent with the 2004 Banning Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

The applicant proposes to provide 50 parking spaces **for the first floor phase**. Based on the Parking Calculation Method, total occupancy would be estimated at 75 persons (1.5 persons per parking space), for an average intensity of 57.7 persons per acre if the gross acreage is used. **Once the second floor is constructed, an additional 20 employee parking spaces will be phased into the abutting property to the east. Based on total of 70 (which encompass all parking spaces) the total occupancy would be estimated at 105 persons. Therefore, the average intensity will be 68 persons per gross acre.**

Part 77: The project site has an elevation ranging from 2,284 to 2,288 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The height of the proposed structure (which includes the future second story) would be 32 feet. Therefore, the elevation at top of roof is projected at 2,312 feet AMSL. The elevation of the runway at its westerly terminus is 2,219 feet AMSL. At a distance of 1,746 feet from the nearest runway, all structures with an elevation at top point exceeding 2,236 feet AMSL will require FAA review. ~~The applicant is currently working on submitting the required information to the FAA.~~

The Form 7460-1 has been submitted, and the FAA has assigned the project Aeronautical Study Numbers 2009-AWP-4697-OE and 2009-AWP-4969-OE.

Noise: The site lies outside the existing 55 CNEL contour. However, the project is located within Compatibility Zone C, which requires an exterior to interior noise reduction of 20dB in all office buildings.

CONDITIONS:

1. Any outdoor lighting installed shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.
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 large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, incinerators, and landfills.)
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
 - (e) Children's schools, hospitals, nursing homes, highly noise-sensitive outdoor nonresidential uses, libraries and day care centers.
3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.
 4. Any retention basin shall be designed so as to provide a maximum 48-hour detention period for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the retention basin that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.
 5. Noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the design of the office areas of the structure, as necessary to ensure interior noise levels from aircraft operations are reduced by a minimum of 20dB.
 6. Prior to the scheduling of the proposed Condition Use Permit case for final action by the City of Banning, the proponent shall file ~~Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, with the Federal Aviation Administration and~~ shall present evidence of a finding of "Not a Hazard to Air Navigation" to Airport Land Use Commission Staff.

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

AGENDA ITEM: 3.1
HEARING DATE: November 12, 2009
CASE NUMBER: ZAP1038BD09 – Desert Storage Masters, LLC
(Representative: T-Mobile, Attn: Monica Moretta)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Indio

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 09-6-940 (Conditional Use Permit)

MAJOR ISSUES: None.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of **CONSISTENCY** for the Conditional Use Permit, subject to the conditions herein.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to develop an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a 70-foot high monopalm, equipment cabinets, GPS antenna, and microwave dish antenna (approximately 675.5 square feet of lease area) on a developed mini-storage and vehicle storage site that encompasses approximately 8 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project site is located southerly of Indio Boulevard and the southerly terminus of Madio Street, westerly of Madison Street, and northerly of Foxglove Lane, in the City of Indio, approximately 4,686 feet southeasterly of the southeasterly terminus of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: 2004 Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

- a. Airport Influence Area: Bermuda Dunes Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zones B1 and C
- c. Noise Levels: The site is traversed by the 55 CNEL noise contour.

BACKGROUND:

Land Use/Intensity: The project site is located within Airport Compatibility Zones B1 and C. The proposed wireless communication facility is within Airport Compatibility Zone C, where “critical community infrastructure facilities” are not prohibited or discouraged uses. In addition, there are no intensity issues, since the project is unmanned.

Part 77: The elevation of the base of the monopalm tower is 24 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the tower would be a maximum of 70 feet in height, so the top point would not exceed 94 feet AMSL. The elevation of the closest runway point is 49.1 feet AMSL. At a distance of approximately 4,686 feet, any structure exceeding 95.9 feet AMSL would require FAA review. Therefore, FAA review was not required, but the applicant submitted the project to FAA and received a determination of “No Hazard to Air Navigation” on August 18, 2009.

Noise: The proposed monopalm facility is located outside the 55 CNEL contour; consequently, no special mitigation for aircraft noise is required as the proposed project is not a noise-sensitive use.

CONDITIONS:

1. Any outdoor lighting installed shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.
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 large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes,

construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, incinerators, and landfills.)

- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- 3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants, and shall be recorded as a deed notice.
- 4. The Federal Aviation Administration has issued a “Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation” for the structure considered through this use permit. Consequently, the latitude, longitude, coordinates, height, and frequencies for this structure shall not be changed, and the site elevation of this structure at top point shall not be increased without further notice to, and review by, the Federal Aviation Administration through the Form 7460-1 process.
- 5. Marking and/or lighting are not required for aviation safety. However, if aviation safety lighting or marking is accomplished on a voluntary basis, such lighting or marking shall be installed and maintained in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2.
- 6. The structure shall not exceed a maximum height of 70 feet above ground level, and the highest point shall not exceed an elevation of 94 feet above mean sea level, without further notice to, and review by, the Federal Aviation Administration pursuant to the Form 7460-1 process.
- 7. Temporary construction equipment used during actual construction of the structure shall not exceed the height of the proposed structure, without further notice to, and review by, the Federal Aviation Administration pursuant to the Form 7460-1 process.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.2

HEARING DATE: November 12, 2009

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1039BD09 – Grinnell Properties, LLC/The Academy Firing Range (Representative: Marsha Vincelette)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP03630 (Conditional Use Permit)

MAJOR ISSUES: Staff's initial use of the disaggregated approach, in which the capacity of each room was calculated independently, indicated a level of population intensity in excess of Airport Compatibility Zone D limitations –perhaps as many as 654 persons on-site. However, such a level of population intensity is not supported by the allocation of parking spaces, which suggests a much lower number of persons on-site. The applicant has provided an alternative occupancy load table indicating that the portions of the buildings proposed for this use will not be occupied by more than 265 people at any given time.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of CONSISTENCY, subject to the conditions included herein, including the incorporation of the applicant's occupancy load table.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Conditional Use Permit No. 3630 (CUP03630) is a proposal to establish a 28-lane indoor firing range and a security academy within two existing buildings, each approximately 19,800 square feet in floor area. The northerly building, except for one existing suite, will house 14 firing lanes and a security academy that will include tactical training area for law enforcement, 9 offices, and 5 training rooms. One existing tenant, a carpet cleaning business, would remain within the northerly building. The southerly building will be occupied by The Academy Firing Range and include 14 firing lanes, a 2,750-square foot uniform supply and fitting area, a gun sales area, 9 offices, and 3 training rooms.

PROJECT LOCATION: The existing buildings have addresses of 38698-A and 38698-B El Viento Road, respectively, and face the easterly side of El Viento Road, southerly of Flora Road and northerly of Las Montanas Road, within Desert Business Park. The business park is located northerly of Interstate 10 and westerly of Washington Street in the unincorporated Riverside community of Bermuda Dunes, approximately 9,570 feet northwesterly of the northwesterly terminus of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: 2004 Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

Adjacent Airport:

- a. Airport Influence Area: Bermuda Dunes Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: Airport Compatibility Zone D
- c. Noise Levels: Below 60 CNEL (Due to changes in parcel configurations since the preparation of the 2004 Compatibility Plan, it is difficult to determine whether the site is entirely outside the 55 CNEL contour line or is crossed by that contour line.)

BACKGROUND:

Nonresidential Intensity: The site is located in Airport Compatibility Zone D. Nonresidential intensity in Airport Compatibility Zone D is restricted to an average of 100 persons per acre and a maximum of 300 persons in any given acre.

Pursuant to Appendix C, Table C-1 of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Building Code indicates the following standard intensities:

Waiting Areas:	one person per 3 square feet
Lobbies:	one person per 7 square feet
Lounges:	one person per 15 square feet
Classrooms:	one person per 20 square feet
Retail Sales:	one person per 30 square feet
Offices:	one person per 100 square feet
Storage/Equipment:	one person per 300 square feet

Staff's initial use of the Building Code method, even with the standard 50% reduction factor, indicated a total intensity of 654 persons on-site: 277 in the northerly building and 377 in the southerly building. Given the site's gross area (including the half-width of El Viento Road adjacent to its frontage) of 3.19 acres, the intensity limit for this site (in the absence of risk-reduction design bonus credits) is 319 persons. If the buildings were used strictly for offices, the total intensity (with application of the 50% factor) would be 198 persons, which would clearly meet both the average and single-acre intensity requirements.

The high intensity of the project "on paper" resulted from the assumptions utilized for this project. The tactical training area was assumed to have the same occupancy level per square foot as a "classroom," and this area, together with the lobby and reception area, account for 174 of the 277 "paper" person intensity in the northerly building. The southerly building includes a 437 square foot waiting area, a lobby, a reception area, and a lounge. These areas together accounted for 255 of the 377 "paper" person intensity in the southerly building.

This project presented yet another situation where staff's initial use of the Building Code method,

applied on a room-by-room basis to a floor plan, yielded a much higher number than the Parking Space method. There are 110 parking spaces on-site, which would indicate an intensity of 165 persons for the two buildings combined. Even if we assumed 3.0 persons per vehicle, this would indicate a total intensity of 330 persons on-site.

In order to address this disparity, staff requested a meeting with the project team (the applicant, architect, and ultimate user), and requested further information regarding the use and occupancy of the various areas within the buildings. At staff's request, the team submitted an occupancy load table that specifies occupancy load for each of these areas.

The applicant's table applies the "exercise room/school shop and vocational room/locker room" standard of one person per 50 square feet to the rooms used for guard training, pistol and long gun assembly training, baton and tactical handcuff training, and pre-range briefing in Building A and the training room, "titanium members" room, pre-range briefing room, and employee break room in Building B. User-defined maximum occupancies were set as follows: 22 for the Building A conference room, 15 for the tactical S.W.A.T. training area, 17 for the Building A firing ranges, range master, and firing range lobby, 8 for the Building B reception area and member orientation area, and 17 for the Building B firing ranges and range master. The Building A reception area, employee kitchen, and file area were included with the office area for intensity calculations, while the Building B uniform area, shoe storage area, and sewing and embroidery room were included as "storage and stock rooms" with an occupancy of one person per 300 square feet. The remaining retail, office, and warehouse areas were evaluated in accordance with Table C1 without use of a 50% reduction factor. The resulting table indicates an occupancy of 265 persons within the areas under the ultimate user's control: 117 in Building A (not counting the existing occupied suite) and 148 in Building B. A total occupancy of 265 persons is consistent with the average and single-acre intensity criteria.

Noise: The site is located outside the area subject to average aircraft noise levels exceeding 60 CNEL, and the use is not noise-sensitive; therefore, no special measures to mitigate aircraft-generated noise are required.

PART 77: No new structures are proposed; therefore, FAA review is not required.

CONDITIONS:

1. Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
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 large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, incinerators, fly ash disposal, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, aquaculture, and landscaping utilizing water features.)
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
 - (e) Children's schools, hospitals, and nursing homes.
3. Occupancy of the two structures, other than the existing suite occupied by a carpet cleaning business as of November 1, 2009, shall not exceed the levels specified in the attached occupancy table without additional review by the Airport Land Use Commission.
4. The County of Riverside shall require additional review by the Airport Land Use Commission prior to the conversion of this area to any use other than the uses specified in the occupancy load table attached hereto, other than offices, manufacturing, storage, and warehousing. In particular, the following uses shall require additional review
- Retail sales facilities (other than carpet cleaning), dormitories, courtrooms, community care facilities, auction rooms, auditoriums, dance floors, lodge rooms, reviewing stands, conference rooms (except within office facilities), dining rooms, exhibit rooms, restaurants, drinking establishments, gymnasiums, lounges, stages, gaming, bowling alleys, swimming pools, and other uses that would be considered to have an occupancy level greater than one person per 100 square feet (minimum square feet per occupant less than 100) pursuant to California Building Code (1998) Table 10-A.
5. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers of the property and tenants of the buildings.
6. Any new detention basins or retention basins shall be designed so as to provide for a detention period for the design storm that does not exceed 48 hours (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the

retention basins that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.

Y:\ALUC\Bermuda Dunes\ZAP1039BD09novsr.doc

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.3 ~~40.4~~

HEARING DATE: November 12, 2009 (originally considered on September 14, 2006)

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-06-113 – AT&T Mobility/Bechtel/Silverhawk Industrial L.P./Rachel Rodgers/ Bechtel/Polly Johnson (Representative: Kathy O’Connor-Phelps, Bemis Development/Derra Design)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO: Plot Plan Case No. 21164

MAJOR ISSUES:

~~The 1996 French Valley CLUP designates this property as being within the Inner Safety Zone, which does not allow structures. This is a situation where the “old” Plan was more restrictive than the suspended 2004 Plan.~~

1. *The Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as carried forth into the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, cite “critical community infrastructure facilities” as a prohibited use in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. These facilities are listed in Note 12 of Table 2A as including “public communications facilities.” Policy 4.2.3.(d) clarifies that such uses are “prohibited unless no other feasible alternative site exists and the facility is designed in a manner that minimizes its susceptibility to damage from an aircraft accident.”*

It may be noted that the Draft March Joint Land Use Study references cell towers as being distinct from “critical community infrastructure facilities.” However, this Study maintains that cell towers are “incompatible” within Zone B1.

2. *The Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division requested in 2006 that the proposed cell tower be lighted. However, the FAA is not requiring lighting for airspace protection purposes.*

RECOMMENDATION:

~~This project is inconsistent with the 1996 French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan if the Specific Plan exemption is not utilized in determining consistency; however, staff would not object to a continuance for two months to allow for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and re-adoption of the 2004 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which would place this property in Airport Zone B1, a zone that would allow unoccupied structures, and to allow for FAA review of the proposed structure.~~

Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY, due to the land use (a public communications facility) being prohibited within Airport Compatibility Zone B1.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Plot Plan No. ~~21164~~ 24436 proposes to establish a ~~70-foot high~~ **an** unmanned telecommunications facility consisting of antennas on a **70-foot high monoelm**, (~~monoelm~~) and equipment shelter, and **GPS antennas** on a 2.68-acre parcel. **The total height to the “top of frond” will not exceed 75 feet above ground level.**

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located northwesterly of the terminus of Innovation Court, **and** northeasterly of Technology Drive, in the community of French Valley, **within** unincorporated Riverside County, approximately 2,154 feet south-southeasterly of Runway 18-36 at French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN: ~~2007~~ 1996 French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use **Compatibility Plan (2007 FVALUCP) (FVACLUP)**

Adjacent Airport:

- a. Airport Influence Area: French Valley Airport
- b. Land Use Policy: **Airport Compatibility Zone B1** ~~Inner Safety Zone in 1996 Plan (Zone B1 on suspended 2004 Plan)~~
- c. Noise Levels: 55-65 CNEL; site is crossed by 60 CNEL contour

BACKGROUND:

~~Land Use:~~ The site is located in the Inner Safety Zone for the runway as proposed to be extended on the French Valley Airport’s Master Plan. The Inner Safety Zone prohibits structures. The property is located within a Specific Plan, and the 1996 Plan as written exempted properties in specific plans from the land use intensity restrictions applicable to other properties within the Plan boundaries; however, the validity of this exemption is questionable, given an opinion issued by the Attorney General of the State of California in 2004. For this reason, the Airport Land Use Commission has asked staff to disregard this exemption in determining the consistency of proposed projects with the 1996 CLUP. Without this exemption, the project is inconsistent with the 1996 CLUP.

Prohibited Uses: The Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as carried forth into the 2007 French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, cite “critical community infrastructure facilities” as a prohibited use in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. These facilities are listed in Note 12 of Table 2A as including “public communications facilities.” Policy 4.2.3.(d) clarifies that such uses are “prohibited unless no feasible alternative site exists and the facility is designed in a manner that minimizes its susceptibility to damage from an aircraft accident.”

The prohibition likely relates to the role that these facilities play in the maintenance of public safety in an emergency situation. There is no general prohibition of new structures in Airport Compatibility Zone B1. Obviously, as an unmanned facility, the project does not present intensity issues.

It may be noted that the Draft March Joint Land Use Study references cell towers as being distinct from “critical community infrastructure facilities.” However, this Study maintains that cell towers are “incompatible” within Zone B1.

It should also be noted that there is an existing cell tower located on a property northwesterly of this property. However, that area is within Airport Compatibility Zone C, where cell towers are not a prohibited use.

Extended Runway Centerline: Pursuant to Table 2A, structures in Airport Compatibility Zone B1 should be located a “maximum distance from [the] extended runway centerline.” This project complies with this requirement.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,303 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The elevation of the runway at the southerly end is 1,340 feet. At a distance of 2,154 feet from the southerly end of the runway as extended to the area of the property proposed as the site of the tower, FAA review would be required for structures with top elevations exceeding 1,361 feet. ~~Therefore, FAA review is required in this situation, given the 70-foot height of the proposed facility.~~

AT&T Mobility filed Form 7460-1 in 2008, and received a “Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation” (Aeronautical Study No. 2008-AWP-4221-OE). The determination is for a height of up to 80 feet above ground level, and allows for a top point elevation as high as 1,390 feet above mean sea level. The determination letter includes a statement that any height exceeding 80 feet above ground level (elevation exceeding 1,390 feet above mean sea level) “will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.”

At the given height and elevation, “the structure does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation.” Therefore, the FAA determined that marking and lighting are not necessary for aviation safety. However, in 2006, the Riverside County Economic Development Agency – Aviation Division, which manages the French Valley

Airport, requested that the tower be “lighted.”

Noise: Noise levels on this site from aircraft operations would range from 55 to 65 CNEL, with the 60 CNEL contour crossing the site. However, the proposed use is not a noise-sensitive use.

In the event that the **Riverside County Airport Land Use** Commission finds this project consistent, ~~pursuant to the Specific Plan exemption~~, or in the event that the Commission finds the proposal inconsistent with the **2007 FVALUCP FVACLUP** but is overruled by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors or its successor-in-interest in accordance with Section 21675.1 of the Public Utilities Code, **ALUC** staff would recommend that the following conditions be applied. ~~plus such supplemental conditions as may be appropriate to implement the requirements of any letter that may be subsequently issued by the Federal Aviation Administration.~~

Implementation of these conditions assists in mitigating impacts of the project on the airport, but would not render the project consistent with the 2007 FVALUCP and may not be sufficient to mitigate potential safety hazards to below a level of significance pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed telecommunications facilities, the property owner shall convey an aviation easement to the County relative to French Valley 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, **or FAA-approved lighting.** .
 - (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. **(Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, wastewater management facilities, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, and incinerators.)**

- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
 4. ~~Prior to issuance of building permits, the project developer shall submit to Airport Land Use Commission staff evidence that the Federal Aviation Administration has issued a determination of "Not a Hazard to Air Navigation" for the proposed facility.~~
 4. 5. Any outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded to ~~assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane~~ **prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky**, and shall comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 655.
 5. **Prior to final inspection approval, any lighting for aviation safety shall be installed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2. Such lighting shall be maintained in accordance therewith for the life of the project.**
 6. **The maximum height of the proposed structure, including all mounted appurtenances and obstruction or aviation safety lighting (if any), shall not exceed 80 feet above ground level, and the maximum elevation at the top of structure (or top of highest frond, whichever is greater) shall not exceed 1,390 feet above mean sea level.**
 7. **The specific coordinates, height, top point elevation, and frequencies of the proposed facility shall not be amended without further review by the Airport Land Use Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration; provided, however, that reduction in building height or elevation shall not require further review by the Airport Land Use Commission.**
 8. **Temporary construction equipment used during actual construction of the structure shall not exceed the height of the proposed structure, unless separate notice is provided to the Federal Aviation Administration through the Form 7460-1 process.**

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.4

HEARING DATE: November 12, 2009

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1061MA09 – Kimley-Horn and Associates, for LNR Property Corporation (Representative: Scott Barker)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: March Joint Powers Authority

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: SP-4 (Specific Plan Amendment)

MAJOR ISSUES: ALUC review of implementing projects; siting of regional detention basins in the Clear Zone and Accident Potential Zone II

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of CONSISTENCY, subject to the conditions specified in the staff report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A proposal to amend the Meridian Specific Plan (initially called the March Business Center Specific Plan) by: (1) changing the acreages designated for various uses – increasing acreages of industrial, commercial, and office uses, and reducing acreages of business park, mixed use, and public facility uses; (2) adding 9.7 acres of open space for stormwater detention; and (3) specifically providing for two 10,000 gallon aboveground diesel fuel storage tanks in the area known as “Lot 16.” The amendment affects 256.7 acres within the “North Campus” area of the Specific Plan.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The “North Campus” comprises approximately 662 acres located northerly of Van Buren Boulevard, southerly of Alessandro Boulevard, and westerly of Interstate 215, within the land use jurisdiction of the March Joint Powers Authority, a minimum of 880 feet westerly of the runway at March Air Reserve Base.

LAND USE PLAN: 1984 Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUCP), as applied to March Air Reserve Base

a. Airport Influence Area: March Air Reserve Base

- b. Land Use Policy: Areas I and II
- c. Noise Levels: From above 60 to above 70 CNEL

BACKGROUND:

The March Business Center Specific Plan was approved by the March Joint Powers Authority in 2003. It was reviewed by ALUC as Case No. MA-02-177 and found consistent with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan, subject to several conditions, including Condition No. 4, which stated as follows:

“The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited, except gas and diesel of 500 gallons or less.”

The applicant proposes to accommodate the operations of Sysco Corporation by providing for an exception that would allow two 10,000-gallon aboveground diesel fuel storage tanks on the property that Sysco plans to purchase for development of its new facility.

Additionally, the applicant is proposing a number of changes to the designations of properties within the “North Campus” area of the Specific Plan, which is now known as the Meridian Specific Plan.

The 256.7-acre area proposed for amendment is currently split among the following designations: Business Park, 119.8 acres; Industrial, 43.0 acres; Mixed Use, 37.0 acres; Commercial, 20.3 acres; Office, 18.3 acres; Public Facility, 15.1 acres; Other, 3.2 acres..

The proposed split of land use designations is as follows: Industrial, 162.7 acres; Office, 26.9 acres; Commercial, 23.2 acres; Mixed Use, 15.6 acres; Business Park, 14.9 acres; Park/Recreation/Open Space, 9.7 acres; and Public Facility, 3.7 acres.

A portion of the area presently designated Mixed Use and Public Facility would be re-designated as Parks/Recreation/Open Space to accommodate a stormwater detention basin. The basin would be dry and vacant at most times, although it would hold water after a rainstorm. The Plan Amendment provides for detention basins in the Clear Zone and Accident Potential Zone. This is an excellent use in dry weather, as it could constitute an emergency landing area; however, when holding water, wildlife attraction would be a concern.

The Specific Plan Amendment document proposes to incorporate the compatibility criteria of the Draft Joint Land Use Study currently being prepared and considered by the March Joint Powers Authority, with the exception of the allowance for the two aboveground diesel tanks referenced above. (Such uses are “discouraged” pursuant to that study.) In conjunction with this, the text includes the following statement:

“Any development complying with the Joint Land Use Study, as adopted herein, is not subject to additional ALUC review.”

ALUC staff has recommended that this statement be deleted, as it fails to reflect the fact that all legislative items (general plan amendments, specific plan amendments, changes of zone, and ordinance amendments) affecting land in an Airport Influence Area must be submitted to ALUC for consideration, even if the underlying General Plan or Specific Plan has been determined to be consistent.

Most of the Specific Plan Amendment area is located within Area II of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area. Policy II in chapter III of the 1984 RCALUCP states that industrial and commercial uses are acceptable in Area II of the March Air Reserve Bare Airport Influence Area.

The following uses would not be permitted within the Specific Plan Amendment area if this proposal is adopted without further change: hazardous waste treatment facilities (not including bio-medical waste treatment facilities), mining and extractive industries, wrecking and dismantling of motor vehicles, assembly and entertainment, churches and places of religious assembly, equestrian show and exhibition facilities, fairgrounds, golf courses, driving ranges, and pitch-and-putt courses, hospitals, intermediate care facilities, and nursing facilities, petroleum products storage, theaters, and zoological parks.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the landowner shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Contact March Joint Powers Authority at (951) 656-7000 for additional information.)
2. Any outdoor lighting installed shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

- (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, livestock operations, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, incinerators, and landfills.)
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.
 5. Any retention basin shall be designed so as to provide a maximum 48-hour detention period for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the retention basin that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be utilized in project landscaping.
 6. Noise attenuation measures shall be incorporated into the design of office areas of structures, as necessary to ensure interior noise levels from aircraft operations are at or below 45 CNEL.
 7. The statement “Any development complying with the Joint Land Use Study, as adopted herein, is not subject to additional ALUC review” shall be deleted.

At the discretion of the applicant and March Joint Powers Authority, it may be replaced as follows:

“Legislative projects, including general plan amendments, changes of zone, ordinance amendments, and subsequent Specific Plan Amendments shall be submitted to ALUC for review. Non-legislative projects located outside the boundary of Airport Area I are not subject to mandatory ALUC review pursuant to the consistency determination for this Specific Plan Amendment.”

8. Condition No. 4 of the letter of conditions for ALUC Case No. MA-02-177 issued by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, which prohibited the above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials, except gas and diesel of 500 gallons or less, is hereby repealed, except for those portions of the Specific Plan located within Airport Area I. Proposals for above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials shall be evaluated with due consideration of the provisions of the Draft Joint Land Use Study, as promulgated by the March Joint Powers Authority.

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.5

HEARING DATE: November 12, 2009

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1062MA09 – Valley Health System/Menifee Valley Medical Center (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Menifee

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PUP 2009-68 (Public Use Permit)

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. Residential uses would be subject to high noise levels during helicopter operations. Single-event noise levels during operations could be as high as 101.8 dB at the nearest residence (on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard from the proposed emergency medical service helicopter landing site). However, the average noise level will be below 60 dB(A) CNEL and below the ambient noise level at the only receptor site where the average noise level would exceed 45 dB(A).

2. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has not yet issued its written airspace determination letter. While the Commission has provided determinations of conditional consistency to projects whose obstruction evaluations are pending, airspace determination letters have consistently been a prerequisite to ALUC approval of new helicopter facilities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing and consider testimony. At this time, staff recommends CONTINUANCE to January 14, 2010, due to lack of an FAA airspace determination letter. However, this recommendation is subject to change in the event that such a letter is received prior to the hearing.

Note: Given that the Commission will not be meeting in December, as an alternative, the Commission may wish to consider a finding of conditional consistency, with a directive that the letter to the City not be issued until the airspace determination letter has been provided to the ALUC Director, and subject to such additional conditions as may be required by the FAA.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Valley Health System proposes to establish an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Helicopter Landing Site at Menifee Valley Medical Center. The facility will consist of a 48-foot square (2,304 square foot) Touchdown and Liftoff Area (TLOF) on an concrete landing pad with associated gurney ramp and wind cone. The facility will comply with most FAA criteria, but will not be marked or lighted, as such marking and lighting is prohibited for EMS landing sites by State law, in order to distinguish them from hospital helistops and other heliports. EMS landing sites do not require the issuance of a State Heliport Permit. As such, the facility may only be used for emergency medical services, departures and landings, including patient transfer to higher level or specialized facilities.

The Final Approach and Takeoff Area (FATO) will be 86 feet by 86 feet (7,396 square feet) in area centered on the TLOF, and will be surrounded by a safety area with a width of 16 feet.

PROJECT LOCATION:

Menifee Valley Medical Center, a hospital, has an address of 28400 McCall Boulevard, and its campus is located on the north side of McCall Boulevard, easterly of Antelope Road, in the recently incorporated City of Menifee. The property is not located within an existing Airport Influence Area. While the closest airport to the site is Perris Valley Airport, staff assigned an “MA” case number because the property would be within the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area if the boundaries proposed in the Draft Joint Land Use Study are eventually adopted.

INTRODUCTION – BASIS FOR REVIEW

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) Policy Document, adopted on October 14, 2004, articulates “procedures and criteria” that the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) “shall utilize when evaluating certain types of airport development proposals that...are subject to ALUC review and are addressed by the Compatibility Plan.” In the case of a new airport or heliport, the proposal may be approved if it is consistent with the specific review policies listed in Section 5.2 of the Countywide Policies.

The ALUCP further states that, in its review of an Airport Master Plan or Airport Layout Plan, the Commission shall focus on the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on the surrounding land uses and must base its review on the proposed airfield design. In this regard, one of the critical issues is whether existing and/or approved land uses in the surrounding area would be considered incompatible with the heliport if the heliport were already in existence. Another critical issue is whether the proposal includes measures to mitigate the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on surrounding land uses. (Such measures could potentially include the siting of flight tracks so as to minimize impacts, selection of operational procedures to minimize impacts, installation of noise barriers or structural noise insulation, and/or acquisition of property interests on the impacted land.) With regard to noise, any proposed construction or alteration “that would result in a significant increase in cumulative noise exposure (measured in terms of CNEL) shall include measures to reduce the exposure to a less-than-significant level.” “In locations having an existing ambient noise level of less than 55 dB CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 5.0 dB or more” would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. However, in areas with

existing ambient noise levels of 55-60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 3.0 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. In areas with existing ambient noise levels greater than 60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 1.5 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase.

SURROUNDING LAND USE:

Much of the area north and west of the hospital is vacant, although portions of this area are slated for development in the near future. There is a recently developed subdivision to the south, on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard. The area to the east of the modern suburban subdivision was subdivided many years ago, and development there has occurred on a lot-by-lot basis, rather than through the mass market development process that has characterized home building in the last sixty years.

EMS HELICOPTER LANDING SITES VIS-À-VIS HELIPORTS:

According to an informational document prepared by the State of California Division of Aeronautics, Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Helicopter Landing Sites are exempt from the requirement for State Permits to operate. Rather than being permitted by the State, they are “designated ...by an officer authorized by a public safety agency, as defined in PUC Section 21662.1, using criteria that the public safety agency has determined is reasonable and prudent for the safe operation of EMS helicopters.” (California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Section 3527(g))

Furthermore, EMS Helicopter Landing Sites must not be marked as a permitted heliport and may only be used for emergency medical purposes. There is also an activity limitation. They may not be used, over any twelve-month period, for more than an average of six landings per month with a patient or patients on the helicopter, except to allow for adequate medical response to a mass casualty event, even if that response causes the site to be used beyond these limits. (There does not seem to be a limit on departures.)

The informational document, prepared in 1997, states that the intent of the legislation was to “allow small or rural medical facilities to accept an occasional emergency patient or transfer a patient to a higher care level hospital. The author further opines that “[b]eing designated as an EMS Helicopter Landing Site with the intent of being used on a regular basis seems inappropriate and could be considered an attempt to circumvent the law” and proceeds to encourage hospitals to develop permitted heliports.

NOISE STUDY:

A noise study was prepared by Acoustics Group, Inc. and submitted to ALUC staff. The acoustical study is predicated on an assumption of eight operations per month. Use of the Eurocopter EC-130, which produces a higher noise level than the other helicopter models that might be used, was assumed in the model in order to generate a “worst-case” noise scenario.

The consultant selected three sensitive receptor locations for the analysis. Receptor R1 is located on the opposite side of McCall Boulevard, at the location of the closest residence. Receptor R2 is

located to the southwest, at the southwesterly corner of McCall Boulevard and the southerly extension of Aspel Road, directly underlying a flight path. Receptor R3 is located on a ridge northeasterly of the site. Ambient noise levels were measured over a 10-minute period at locations R1 and R3. The Leq was determined to be 64.6 dB(A) at R1 and 49.3 dB(A) at R3. Ambient noise levels were not measured at R2 due to ongoing construction activity at that location.

The noise study utilized the Federal Aviation Administration's Integrated Noise Model (INM) Version 7.0 to determine the future noise levels from the proposed helistop operations. The model projects that, based on an estimate of four departures and four arrivals per month (two each in day and one each in evening and night hours), the average noise level from helicopter operations would be 58.2 dB(A) CNEL at R1, 45.0 dB(A) CNEL at R2, and 33.0 dB(A) CNEL at R3.

Acoustics Group, Inc. then proceeded to evaluate these levels in light of noise from future traffic. Based on the County Circulation Element designation of McCall Boulevard as a 6-lane Urban Arterial Highway with an ADT (average daily traffic) level of 43,100 vehicles, it was determined that future traffic noise would be 79 dB(A) at R1 and R2, and 66 dB(A) at R3. With average noise levels from helicopter operations below 60 dB(A) CNEL at R1 and below 50 dB(A) CNEL at the other receptor locations, they have no effect on future average noise levels.

The noise study states that the helistop generated CNEL will be below the ambient background CNEL generated by future traffic. The CNEL from helicopter operations will not result in an increase in the CNEL based on existing modeled traffic levels. Furthermore, the CNEL from helicopter operations will be 6.4 decibels less than the measured ambient noise level.

The noise study does go a step beyond projecting the average noise level to address single-event noise levels and notes that single event noise will be "clearly discernable" at these receptor locations. The SEL levels would be 101.8 dB at R1, 88.6 dB at R2, and 76.6 dB at R3. The single-event or peak noise level is acknowledged to be a major factor in the degree of annoyance generated by aircraft operations. As stated on page 2 of the noise study, the factors of importance in this matter would include the "magnitude of the event sound level with respect to the background; duration of the sound event; number of event occurrences and their repetitiveness; and time of day that the event occurs."

The study recommends the following noise reduction measures:

- “1. Helicopter idle time should be minimized as much as possible.
2. If noise is expressed as an issue by the community, than noise monitoring should be conducted during the initial stages of operations. In the event that the noise criteria are exceeded, the operations should be reviewed to determine further noise control measures. Alternative flight tracks may need to be implemented if annoyances are encountered.”

FAA AIRSPACE DETERMINATION:

The project representative has submitted a Notice of Landing Area Proposal to the Federal Aviation Administration. In a letter dated October 19, 2009, Jeffrey Wright states that an "FAA inspector

visited the site on October 8, 2009 and found our plans acceptable from an airspace utilization standpoint.” However, a written airspace determination letter has not been received for this project.

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

1. No operations (takeoffs or landings) shall be conducted until such time as an officer of an authorized public safety agency, as defined in Section 21662.1 of the State of California Public Utilities Code, has designated the facility as an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Landing Site and has issued a written determination that the site is “reasonable and prudent for the safe operation of EMS helicopters.”
2. The heliport shall be designed and constructed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5390-2B, *Heliport Design*, except that the site shall not be marked as a permitted heliport as described .
3. Establishment and operations shall comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration letter dated _____, a copy of which is attached hereto.
4. Helicopter idle time shall be minimized as much as possible.
5. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) requests that Menifee Valley Medical Center consider returning to ALUC to seek advisory comments regarding mitigation of noise impacts on surrounding properties in the event that the average number of monthly operations exceeds eight (8) over any given three-month period.

ADDITIONALLY, THE CITY MAY WISH TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING OR SIMILAR MEASURES TO ADDRESS HELIPORT USAGE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE USE PERMIT FOR THE FACILITY:

- A. Heliport usage shall be monitored by Menifee Valley Medical Center so as to limit operations to an average of four arrivals and four departures per month, except in mass casualty or community disaster situations, as recognized by City, State or Federal authorities.

**COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 3.6

HEARING DATE: November 12, 2009

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: ZAP1012FL09 – Riverside Healthcare System/Riverside Community Hospital (Representative: Jeff Wright, Heliplanners)

APPROVING JURISDICTION: State of California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics (State Airport Permit); City of Riverside (Conditional Use Permit)

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: P09-0694 (Conditional Use Permit)

MAJOR ISSUES:

1. Residential uses, including apartments and single-family homes, as well as a playground on a former school site and a cemetery, would be subject to high noise levels during helicopter operations. Single-event noise levels during operations could be as high as 114.3 dB at the southerly end of the former site of Grant Elementary School (on the opposite side of 14th Street from the proposed hospital helistop).

2. Future helicopter operations are projected to result in an average noise level of 71.6 dB(A) at the former school site. While this is lower than the future traffic noise level projected for this site (75.6 dB(A)), it exceeds the measured ambient noise level at this site (66.7 dB(A) Leq) by 4.9 dB. When evaluated in light of existing modeled traffic levels, the helicopter operations result in a 2.0 dB increase in noise levels at that site, which is greater than the 1.5 dB increase significance threshold for areas with existing ambient noise levels exceeding 65 dB(A) CNEL. (However, this significance threshold is not reached if the helicopter operations are evaluated in light of projected average noise levels under future traffic conditions.)

3. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has not yet issued its written airspace determination letter. While the Commission has provided determinations of conditional consistency to projects whose obstruction evaluations are pending, airspace determination letters have consistently been a prerequisite to ALUC approval of new helicopter facilities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing and consider testimony. At this time, staff recommends CONTINUANCE to January 14, 2010, primarily due to the lack of

an FAA airspace determination letter. Additionally, given the noise impact at the former school site across the street from the proposed helistop site, staff would request Commission direction as to whether to ask the project team to evaluate alternative sites on the hospital campus or alternative flight paths.

In the event that the Commission does not request evaluation of alternative sites or alternative flight paths, as an alternative to a two month continuance, the Commission may wish to consider a finding of conditional consistency, with a directive that the letter to the City not be issued until the airspace determination letter has been provided to the ALUC Director, and subject to such additional conditions as may be required by the FAA.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Riverside Healthcare System proposes to establish a heliport (specifically, a hospital helistop) atop the top deck of the parking structure at Riverside Community Hospital. The facility will consist of a 54-foot square (2,916 square foot) Touchdown and Liftoff Area (TLOF) on an elevated metal landing pad with associated gurney ramp, safety net, wind cone, lighting, and painted markings, and the design will comply with FAA requirements..

The Final Approach and Takeoff Area (FATO) will be 98 feet by 98 feet (9,604 square feet) in area centered on the TLOF, and will be surrounded by a safety area with a width of 18 feet.

The acoustical study prepared by Acoustics Group, Inc. is predicated on an assumption of six operations per week. The Eurocopter EC-130, which produces a higher noise level than the other models that might be used, was utilized to generate the noise analysis. The California Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division requires a new heliport permit application for special-use heliports, which in turn triggered the requirement for Airport Land Use Commission review.

PROJECT LOCATION:

Riverside Community Hospital has an address of 4445 Magnolia Avenue, and its campus is located on the west side of Magnolia Avenue, south of 14th Street, north of Terracina Drive, and east of Brockton Avenue, at the southwesterly corner of the “downtown” area of the City of Riverside. The property is not located within an existing Airport Influence Area.

INTRODUCTION – BASIS FOR REVIEW

As stated in Section 1.5.1 of the Countywide Policies of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, any “proposal for a new airport or heliport whether for public use or private use (Public Utilities Code Section 21661.5)” requires referral to the Airport Land Use Commission for a determination of consistency with the Commission’s Plan prior to approval by the local jurisdiction “if the facility requires a state airport permit.” The Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) Policy Document, adopted on October 14, 2004, articulates “procedures and criteria” that the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) “shall utilize when evaluating certain types of airport development proposals that...are subject to ALUC review and are addressed by the Compatibility Plan.” In the case of a new airport or heliport, the proposal may be

approved if it is consistent with the specific review policies listed in Section 5.2 of the Countywide Policies.

The ALUCP further states that, in its review of an Airport Master Plan or Airport Layout Plan, the Commission shall focus on the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on the surrounding land uses and must base its review on the proposed airfield design. In this regard, one of the critical issues is whether existing and/or approved land uses in the surrounding area would be considered incompatible with the heliport if the heliport were already in existence. Another critical issue is whether the proposal includes measures to mitigate the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts on surrounding land uses. (Such measures could potentially include the siting of flight tracks so as to minimize impacts, selection of operational procedures to minimize impacts, installation of noise barriers or structural noise insulation, and/or acquisition of property interests on the impacted land.) With regard to noise, any proposed construction or alteration “that would result in a significant increase in cumulative noise exposure (measured in terms of CNEL) shall include measures to reduce the exposure to a less-than-significant level.” “In locations having an existing ambient noise level of less than 55 dB CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 5.0 dB or more” would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. However, in areas with existing ambient noise levels of 55-60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 3.0 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase. In areas with existing ambient noise levels greater than 60 CNEL, a project that would increase the noise level by 1.5 dB or more would be considered to result in a significant noise increase.

SURROUNDING LAND USE:

The land uses surrounding the hospital consist largely of urban uses that are not appropriate for areas surrounding airports, such as an elementary school (which is no longer in school use, but may still be utilized as a playground and an assembly area for community or neighborhood meetings), apartments, single-family residences, and churches. If this were not a hospital-related heliport, this would be a clearly inconsistent location for an aviation facility due to the associated land use incompatibilities (both safety and noise).

However, in this case, the safety and noise hazards must be balanced against the health and safety benefits of the facility. According to the Riverside Community Hospital website, the hospital is a Level Two Trauma Center, and its Emergency Room, with a 50-bed capacity, is the County’s largest. It is expected that the primary situation in which the helistop would be used would be for the transport of critically ill and injured patients from emergency scenes and from other health care facilities.

NOISE STUDY:

A noise study was prepared by Acoustics Group, Inc. and submitted to ALUC staff. The consultant selected three sensitive receptor locations for the analysis. Receptor R1 is the point on the campus of Grant Elementary School (no longer in use as a school) that is closest to the projected approach/departure track, which is basically at the southerly property boundary along 14th Street. Receptor R2 is located at the Bridgeport Apartments on Pine Street. Receptor R3 is located in a group of residences located on 14th Street, westerly of Brockton Avenue. Ambient noise levels were

measured over a 20-minute period at locations R1 and R2. The Leq was determined to be 66.7 dB(A) at R1 and 59.4 at R2.

The noise study utilized the Federal Aviation Administration's Integrated Noise Model (INM) Version 7.0 to determine the future noise levels from the proposed helistop operations. The model projects that, based on an estimate of three departures and three arrivals per week (one each in day, evening, and night hours), the average noise level from helicopter operations would be 71.6 dB(A) CNEL at R1, 40.5 dB(A) CNEL at R2, and 49.8 dB(A) CNEL at R3.

Acoustics Group, Inc. then proceeded to evaluate these levels in light of noise from future traffic. Based on the concept of the adjacent segment of 14th Street being a 4-lane Major Highway with an ADT (average daily traffic) level of 27,000 vehicles, it was determined that future traffic noise would be 75.6 dB(A) at R1 and R3. With average noise levels from helicopter operations below 50 dB(A) CNEL at R3, they have no effect on future average noise levels at that site. As to R1, however, the additive effect of the helicopter operations increases the cumulative noise from traffic and helicopter sources by 1.4 dB – just below the significance threshold. The resulting average noise level is 77 dB(A) CNEL.

The noise study states that the helistop generated CNEL will be below the ambient background CNEL generated by future traffic. However, when evaluated in relation to modeled existing traffic levels, the additive effect of the helicopter operations increases the cumulative noise from traffic and helicopter operations by 2.0 dB – above the significance threshold (1.5 dB).

The noise study does go a step beyond projecting the average noise level to address single-event noise levels and notes that single event noise will be “clearly discernable” at these receptor locations. This is an understatement, in that SEL levels would be 83.2 dB at R2, 92.4 dB at R3, and a whopping 114.3 dB at R1. The single-event or peak noise level is acknowledged to be a major factor in the degree of annoyance generated by aircraft operations. As stated on page 2 of the noise study, the factors of importance in this matter would include the “magnitude of the event sound level with respect to the background; duration of the sound event; number of event occurrences and their repetitiveness; and time of day that the event occurs.”

The single-event noise level at R1 would qualify as a nuisance exterior sound level if generated by a noise source subject to the City of Riverside's noise ordinance (Title 7 of the Riverside Municipal Code). Section 7.25.010 provides that, “[u]nless a variance has been granted..., it shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow the creation of any noise which exceeds...[t]he exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus fifteen decibels, for the cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or [t]he exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus twenty decibels...for any period of time.” The exterior noise standard within the residential land use category is specified in Table 7.25.010A as 55 dB(A) from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. and as 45 dB(A) from 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. The standard is 60 dB(A) for the community support land use category, 65 dB(A) for office/commercial and public recreation facilities, and 70 dB(A) for industrial and nonurban areas.

The study recommends the following noise reduction measures:

- “1. Helistop operations should not exceed the permitted capacity.

2. The number of evening and nighttime operations should be minimized as much as possible.
3. Helicopter idle time should be minimized as much as possible.
4. Noise monitoring should be conducted during the initial stages of operations to determine compliance with local noise criteria. Alternative flight tracks may need to be implemented if annoyances are encountered.”

FAA AIRSPACE DETERMINATION:

The project representative has submitted a Notice of Landing Area Proposal to the Federal Aviation Administration. In a letter dated October 19, 2009, Jeffrey Wright states that an “FAA inspector visited the site on October 8, 2009 and found our plans acceptable form an airspace utilization standpoint.” However, a written airspace determination letter has not been received for this project.

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

1. No operations (takeoffs or landings) shall be conducted until such time as the State of California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics has issued a Site Approval Permit and subsequent Heliport Permit pursuant to Sections 3525 through 3560 of Title 21 of the California Code of Regulations.
2. The heliport shall be designed and constructed in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5390-2B, *Heliport Design*.
3. Establishment and operations shall comply with the recommendations and requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration letter dated _____, a copy of which is attached hereto.
4. Helicopter idle time shall be minimized as much as possible.
5. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) requests that Riverside Community Hospital consider returning to ALUC to seek advisory comments regarding mitigation of noise impacts on surrounding properties in the event that the average number of weekly operations exceeds six (6) within any given monthly period.

ADDITIONALLY, THE CITY MAY WISH TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING OR SIMILAR MEASURES TO ADDRESS HELIPORT USAGE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE USE PERMIT FOR THE FACILITY:

- A. Heliport usage shall be monitored by Riverside Community Hospital so as to limit operations to an average of three arrivals and three departures per week, except in mass casualty or community disaster situations, as recognized by City, State or Federal authorities.

Staff Report
Page 6 of 6

Y:\ALUC\Flabob\ZAP1012FL09novsr.doc

RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- 4.1** 2010 Finalized Submission Schedule. At its October 8, 2009 meeting, the Airport Land Use Commission tentatively selected July and November as its “dark” months for the year 2010. Attached is a preliminary submission schedule illustrating this decision. If confirmed, the July and November hearing dates (shown in the text boxes with the dashed borders) would be deleted on the finalized submission schedule, and the extended windows for project submittal for the June and October hearings (deadlines in *bold italic* type) would be inserted in lieu of the submittal deadline that would exist pursuant to a monthly schedule (deadlines in ~~striketrough~~ type).

Y:\ALUC\ALUC Administrative Items\Admin. 2009\ADmin Item 11-12-09.doc