

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Community Room
Temecula, CA 92590

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2002
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on January 24, 2002 at Rancho California Water District, 42135 Winchester Road, Community Room, Temecula, CA 92590.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ed Adkison, Chairman
William Cobb, Vice Chairman
Allen Graff
Marge Tandy
Paul Bell [Alternate for Paul Gill]
Walt Snyder
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Paul Gill
Jim Potts

OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Fulton, Christian Schools of the Desert
Tim Holt, Architect, Christian Schools of the Desert
Chris Del Ross-Risher, KCT Consultants
Doug Shackelton, Canty Engineering & Singh Chevrolet
Philip Hannawi, Principal Engineer, City of Riverside
Finn Comer, Lee & Associates
Patti Nahill, T&B Consultants
Aida Hercules, Keith Companies
Sandra Finn, Winchester Creek Dev., L.P. & Markham Dev.
Mgmt. Group
Martin Rauscher, Community Member/Homeowner
Earle Newcomber, Community Member/Homeowner
Ken Woolsey, Community Member/Homeowner
Sandi Finn, Markham Dev. Management Group
Kevin McGuire, Community Member/Homeowner
Don Levitz, 116 Applicant
Rod Hanway, The Garret Group

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, A.L.U.C. Executive Director
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
Pat Moore, Office Assistant

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Adkison.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. ELECTION OF OFFICERS. Chairman Adkison advised the commission of his resignation from the Commission. Chairman Adkison then called for a motion to elect a new Chairman. Commissioner Graff made a motion to elect William Cobb as Chairman. Chairman Adkison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Cobb called for a motion to elect a Vice Chairman. Former Chairman Adkison made a motion to elect Allen Graff for Vice Chairman. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 15, 2001:

Newly elected Chairman Cobb called for a motion to approve the minutes.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the minutes. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Commissioner Cobb abstained from voting. The motion was carried unanimously.

Comments from B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel were received on 1/23/02, and include update verbiage relative to Conditions of Approval and as stated: “subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report” (See Applicable Cases MA-01-170, MA-01-173, RI-01-141, FV-01-113 and FV-01-117) . An additional comment updated the verbiage on Cases FV-01-113 & FV-01-117 from ‘Draft Environmental Assessment’ to “Recommended Noise Mitigation.”

- VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. BD-01-112 – Christian Schools of the Desert. Keith Downs informed the Commission that a request for continuance had been by the applicant. Mr. Downs further added that the staff report had been modified and referred them to the letter received from CalTrans, in which the applicant had added 600 additional persons.

Mr. Downs continued by briefing the Commission on the project.

Chairman Cobb inquired with Keith of the FAA was the cause, to which Mr. Downs indicated that it was not dependent upon a 7460 review.

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

Dave Fulton, applicant, Christian Schools of the Desert came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Mr. Fulton came forward and voiced his lack of understanding about the student size problem, and stated he was unaware of mandates due to their close proximity with the Bermuda Dunes Airport. He continued by saying that the project calls for 800-1,000 students (though they are currently set for 800), and that he had no knowledge of the issue until November regarding the FAA review. Mr. Fulton informed the Commission that they were previously approved in 1996. He voiced his concerns relative to a costly relocation, children safety issues, and overcrowding of schools in the Coachella Valley, and mentioned a vast need for more school facilities. Mr. Fulton noted that the last structural modification/expansion was at 5%.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners for the applicant. Vice Chairman Graff inquired if the project consisted of a 24 hr. day facility. Mr. Fulton responded by stating it was a Day School and deemed as a 'church use', which is not set or starting, since they rent out to similar churches who do not have facilities, and will not include boarding.

Chairman Cobb called for further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case.

In response to Chairman Cobb's invitation Tim Holt came forward with an "Existing Site Plan" exhibit, in which he identified the ITZ area west bound of Yucca Lane, and a Master Plan denoting future plans for Christian Schools of the Desert [depicting new structures]. Mr. Holt advised the Commission of the FAA 7460 review submittal in October, but due to the current tragedy of September findings are pending, and are expected within the week. He continued by noting that ____ foot poles will not be used for the sports lighting. Mr. Holt also added that he felt that the FAA's review would offset CalTrans findings due to the corrected area of significance overlay. He continued on by complimenting staff relative to report generation and meetings held with him based on the project. Mr. Holt then confirmed his agreement with staff's recommendations and made himself available for questions from the Commission.

Chairman Cobb called for further questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Graff inquired if the applicant would have a lighted scoreboard for the football field. Mr. Holt responded positively, then Commissioner Graff inquired as to the location, in which the applicant stated it would be at the end-zone area.

Commissioner Graff advised that the lighted could be misinterpreted by pilots and asked if the lighting would be downward facing. Mr. Holt, the applicant's rep. replied affirmatively and noted that they would be reflective.

Commissioner Adkison inquired if the project had been previously approved. Mr. Holt responded affirmatively and noted this had taken place in 1992. Commissioner Adkison then inquired if the project was found to be consistent. Mr. Holt replied positively. Commissioner Adkison then asked the applicant if the Master Plan contained any structures. Dave Fulton, applicant noted that the Master Plan had

been adopted in 1979, and in 1992' the project was found to be consistent, at which time current overlapment, parking, student areas and administrative housing had not been brought into play.

Commissioner Adkison noted the Southwest Juvenile Center that was disallowed, yet had gotten overridden. A discussion then ensued between Commissioner Tandy, Keith Downs and Commissioner Cobb pertaining to the West Valley project in Hemet that experienced an overruling. The conversation also covered school districting, CalTrans recommendation and involvement.

Chairman Cobb inquired with Keith Downs about the exhibit, specifically the east/west end of runway and questioned if it was symmetrical. Keith Downs responded that the exhibit was based upon a 1986 adoption, the concerns now consist of a greater significance involving the safety zone. Mr. Downs noted that the new Master Plan is similar, though no significant changes have been made per the airport manager.

Another discussion ensued in which Mr. Downs relayed information provided by the Airport Manager, Mr. Smith in which the GPS was denied due to a northern approach to the project. Caltrans and FAA both deemed the project as a 'non-hazard' to navigation.

Commissioner Adkison inquired with Keith Downs relative to this issue. Mr. Downs replied that anything above Part 77 would be applicable. He added that if the project were close to 80 ft. a lower possibility would exist for light removal.

Hearing no further questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Downs, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for further discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Snyder noted that there is a shortage of schools in the area due to problems with overriding. Commissioner Bell voiced his concern relative to right turning for emergencies at the end of the runway and close proximity of people to its location. Vice Chairman Graff voiced his concern with renting out the location to other churches, and stated ALUC's rules and regulations governing this issue. He also noted the previous approval and the applicant's unawareness of problems. Vice Chairman Graff noted that the applicant is doing well at their current size and capacity and suggested a satellite location outside of the airport's boundary. He voiced his feeling that this is not the proper place and time for such a project. Commissioner Tandy inquired if a determination was dependent upon CalTrans, to which Chairman Cobb responded by stating that Keith Downs had also mentioned the Part 77, which needs to be taken into consideration.

Dave Fulton, applicant, interjected that a condition could be mandated stating that rental should not exceed 800. He added that they have been approved for 800, but their preference is for 1,000.

Another discussion ensued between the applicant, Mr. Fulton, Chairman Cobb, Keith Downs, Commissioner Tandy, and Commissioner's Adkison, Snyder and Vice Chairman Graff involving campus size and capacity, traffic issues due to special events, ALUC's role and GPS Approach.

Hearing no further comments from the Commissioner's or audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Graff made a motion to find the project inconsistent, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval 6,7, and 8, involving church or civic limited assemblies. He added these could be referenced in the case of an override. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

MARCH RESERVE BASE

9:15 A.M.

A. MA-01-170 – KCT Consultants – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: MA 01-170 Previous MA-01-119
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Design Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

632,000 sq. ft. of Office/Warehouse with 7,000 sq. ft. of office space on 28.9 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated west of the railroad tracks, and south of Cottonwood Ave. and north of Alessandro Blvd., within the City of Riverside approximately 9,000-12,000 feet northwesterly of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area I, AICUZ Zone II
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

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

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: However, no In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current effort is an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook. Changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adjusted in 1986.

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

- a. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
- b. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
- c. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
- d. Noise data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
- e. 98/99 Draft CLUP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 9,000- 12,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of approximately 28.9(net) acres. The existing site is zoned for industrial business uses. The proposal is underlying the Runway 14-32 PART 77 approach and departure tracks and within the approach surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I, and would preclude residential uses. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of APZ Safety Zone II, and within the approach and departure profiles for Runway 14/32. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The total number of employees on the site will be 80 and the coverage standard for the zone is 50%.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is 1,550 MSL feet. The highest structure will be 38 feet. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 1,688-1,738MSL feet in elevation. Any construction above an elevation of 1640MSL will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

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

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposal consistent with the RCALUP, and is subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report. (per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)

APPENDICES:

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA I. Area I, Policy #1 states: "Area I shall be kept free of all high risk land uses" (Appendix B). The use, manufacturing land warehousing is not a High Risk use.

Conclusion: The proposed project is consistent with that proposal. The Matrix Table I identifies all the applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans' criteria.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the area as within APZ II and within the 70+ CNEL.

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

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

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

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

A first draft of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, but no further text has been completed. The graphics are completed. The site is within APZ II and uses such as manufacturing and warehousing is allowed.

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

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Consistent	Consistent*
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent*
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent*

* with additional noise insulation

CONDITIONS:

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by the airport operator or an airport lighting consultant prior to placement.*
4. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such obstruction:*
 - a. *Any proposal for a variance in height limitations of the applicable zone, or for a plot plan or use permit proposing a greater height limit pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, shall be transmitted to the Riverside County ALUC staff for a determination of whether review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission is required. The application for such a proposal shall also provide evidence to the Planning Department that the proposed has been submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77, or written documentation from the Federal Aviation Administration that such review is not required.*
 - b. *The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.*
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
4. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

Chairman Cobb inquired with Keith Downs if the office and warehouse issues met with CAL OSHA requirements. Keith Downs responded positively and noted the presence of forklifts. Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired if the 80-person per 29 acre on site included both office and warehouse. Mr. Downs responded affirmatively.

Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Chris Del Ross-Risher, KCT Consultants, came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Ms. Del Ross-Risher stated that the office/warehouse at it's highest shift (Christmas and Pre-Christmas) would operate with 80 employees.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller inquired with the applicant what type of materials would be stored or manufactured at the warehouse. Ms. Del-Ross Risher, applicant, replied that it would be a complete furniture warehouse.

Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel reiterated that the project was found to be consistent relative to the RCALUP and conditions set forth by staff.

- B. MA-01-173 – Canty Engineering Group - Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER:	<u>MA-01-173- Canty Engineering Group</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO:	CUP Revised

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A 13,000 sq. ft. Multi-Use Bldg. addition to the existing Tennis Center.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated east of Alessandro Blvd., at 5695 Glenhaven Ave., approximately 29,000 feet northwesterly of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

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

BACKGROUND:

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

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments; However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adjusted in 1986.

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

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

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 29,000 feet west of Runway 14-32. The site consists of a sports complex for tennis and swimming with a sanctuary with classroom, parking and open space on 5.27 acres. The existing site has two structures totaling 5,600 sq. ft. The proposal is approximately 3,000 feet from an approach and departure track and within the outer horizontal surfaces. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B. The proposed addition would bring the building total to 18,600 sq. ft.

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of the Traffic Pattern Zone.

Density and Coverage: The currently proposed structural coverage on the site for the current proposal is approximately 3%. Future development would raise that percentage to 8%. The surrounding residential density is at 3-4 dwelling units per acre.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1165MSL feet and the maximum building height is 46 feet. Any structure exceeding 2,088 MSL would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have less than 55 CNEL, but previous AICUZ indicated higher noise levels.

Other: The Traffic Pattern Zones (TPZ) of other CLUP's define facilities such as churches, amphitheaters, community halls, sports facilities, and outdoor lighting as 'discouraged uses' and require the evaluation of alternative sites.

Conclusion: The proposed project is consistent with that proposal. The matrix Table I identifies all the applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with or applicable to those plans' criteria.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposal consistent with the RCALUP, and is subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report. (per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)

APPENDIX:

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA III, which has no land use constraints other than noise and aviation easements.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the Traffic Pattern Zone outer boundary as the outer edge of the military PART 77 conical surface. None of the project is within that boundary as shown on Exhibit 8. The plan places the property outside of the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The proposal would be consistent with or outside of the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

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

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999) and as the outside boundary of the plan
4. PART 77 boundaries.

The site is outside of the Traffic Pattern Zone and 55 CNEL. The text would require an acoustical analysis for all projects within the 60 CNEL.

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

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Consistent	Consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent*	Consistent*
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent *	Consistent*

* Outside of Planning Boundary

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.*
3. *All office and classroom portions of the project shall be insulated so that the interior shall be at a 45 CNEL.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - d. *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.*
 - e. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

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

Doug Shackelton, Canty Engineering came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation, and voiced his concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval for the project.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners to the applicant. Commissioner Bell inquired if a swimming pool would be applicable. Mr. Shackelton responded by saying that it would not be used or applicable.

Hearing no further questions from the Commissioner's, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for further discussion from the Commission. Commissioner Adkison advised the Commission that the CLUP for March has been adopted with changes. Hearing no further comments, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

9:30 A.M.

- C. RI-01-135 – City of Riverside – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations. Mr. Downs displayed a detailed exhibit of the underpass, and noted that Condition of Approval #1 would only be applicable if ownership or exhibit change were to take place.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: RI-01-135- City of Riverside
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is the construction of an Underpass for Jurupa Ave., between Florence St. and Tucson Ct. and the closure of Mountain View Ave.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated on Jurupa Ave. at the Union Pacific Railroad, easterly of Florence Ave. west of Tucson Ct. within the City of Riverside and 5,000 feet northeast of Runway 9-27.

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

*a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately from 5,000 feet northeast of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the TPZ. The present project would be consistent with the plan.*

NOISE: *The site is not a noise sensitive use.*

PART 77: These will be placed at elevations ranging from 772MSL to 778MSL, which is below the conical surface elevation of 966 MSL. The surface of the Runways varies from 757 to 815 MSL.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (May not be practical due to current ownership).
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. A discussion then ensued between Vice Chairman Graff and Keith Downs involving the length of construction time, cranes and lighting and blowing dust, in which Mr. Downs advised that since the airport is one mile away and not higher Part 77 is not applicable.

Hearing no further responses, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Philip Hannawi, Principal Engineer, City of Riverside came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Mr. Hannawi advised that he had recently attended the Planning Commission Hearing on February 7th relative to the project.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- D. RI-01-137 – Lee & Associates - Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER:	<u>RI-01-137 – Lee & Associates</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	Design Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a permit to construct a new 80,000 sq. ft. Mini-Storage Buildings on a 7.96-acre parcel.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 6761 Van Buren Blvd., approximately 1,000 feet north of Arlington Avenue within the City of Riverside and approximately 900 feet southerly of Runway 9/27 and 1,100 feet westerly of Runway 16/31 at the Riverside Airport. The site is under or near a flight track centerline.

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

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 900 feet southeasterly of Runway 9/27. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for construction of self-storage consisting of an 80,000 sq. ft. and caretakers residence building on 7.96 acres. The TPZ has no population density assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The lot coverage of the buildings at the site is 25% of the gross area.

NOISE: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

PART 77: The elevation at the site is 767 MSL. The height of the structure is 27 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, which has a surface elevation of 966 MSL. An FAA 7460 review is required and has been forwarded by the applicant.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office and residential portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed and any required lighting shall be included in construction.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

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

Finn Comer, Lee & Associates came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Mr. Comer voiced his concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. Upon hearing no response or reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for any comments from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff inquired if the project was residential facility consisting of a second floor. Keith Downs displayed the exhibit for the project, in which no residential notation was made.

Chairman Cobb inquired if a caretaker would be on the premises, to which Keith Downs responded affirmatively. Vice Chairman Graff voiced his reservation in determining consistency for the project, due to its proximity of the airport and no noise buffer.

Keith Downs responded that the noise would be far less than that of an aircraft. Upon further discussion, it was determined that Condition of Approval #3 be modified as follows: "Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office and residential portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels."

Chairman Cobb called for further questions, and upon hearing no response or reply from the audience; Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- E. RI-01-138 – Kuldeep Kahlon - Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER:	<u>RI-01-138 - Kuldeep Kahlon</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	Conditional Use Permit #

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a conditional use permit for an existing convenience store to add alcohol sales.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5690 Tyler St., east of Street, south of Cypress Avenue within the City of Riverside and approximately 9,500 feet southwesterly of Runway 16/34 at Riverside Airport. The site is under or near a flight track centerline.

<i>Adjacent Airport:</i>	<i>Riverside Municipal Airport</i>
<i>Land Use Policy:</i>	<i>CLUP adopted April 1998</i>

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 9,500 feet southwesterly of Runway 16/34. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence

NOISE: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport.

PART 77: The elevation at the site is approximately XXX MSL and the building height is approximately 25 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location and is well below the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL Area. The proposal is to add alcohol sales to an existing retail store. The present proposal would be consistent with the plan.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibels levels.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon receiving no response, Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward. After again hearing no response, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff’s Conditions of Approval. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- F. RI-01-141 – Singh Chevrolet - Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-01-141 - Singh Chevrolet
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Variance

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request to construct a Two-Story (28 ft) Building where one-story is allowed.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated southerly of SR 91 and west of the of Jefferson St., within the City of Riverside, and approximately 9,500 feet southerly of the east end of the Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 9500 feet south of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is to build two 2,000 sq. ft. buildings and vehicle sales facilities on a 55,000 sq. ft. parcel.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is approximately 883 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 28 feet. The site and is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. Any structure over 900 MSL would need an FAA review.*

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, and is subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report. (per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)*

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

Doug Shackelton, Canty Engineering came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation, and made himself available for any questions from the Commissioners.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. Upon hearing no response or reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:45 A.M.

- G. FV-01-112 – Pulte Home Corp. – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-01-112– Pulte Home Corp.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Tract Map 30312

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for Tract Map 30312 on approximately 8.3 acres consisting of 25 single-family dwelling units.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located southeast of Finbrook Road and North General Kearny Road, 9,200 feet south east of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: *French Valley*
a. Airport Influence Area: *Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ),*
b. Noise Levels: *Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: *The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. The CLUP indicates that residential uses in the 60 CNEL are not compatible. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project.*

Land Use: *The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the total tract should range between 15% and 25% of the project, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).*

Height: *The highest elevation on the site is 1145.6 MSL and the structures are not expected to exceed 30 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1500 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. PART 77 airspace obstructions are not a concern.*

Conclusion: *The residential and open space portions of the proposal are consistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: *For County utilization*

1. *Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
4. *The land division is amended to recognize the Traffic Pattern Zone in the CLUP and included in the appropriate and graphic illustrations of the Environmental Constraints Sheet.*
5. *Any acoustical study for the site should include noise from the overflying aircraft within the analysis and discuss mitigations.*
6. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

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

The applicant's representative, Patti Nahill, T&B Consultants came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Ms. Nahill voiced her concurrence with staff's Conditions and Approval, recommendations and map exhibit.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. No response was heard from the audience. Hearing no reply, Chairman Cobb called for any discussion from the Commission. Commissioner Bell voiced his concern with noise level increases and advised/suggested adding a Condition of Approval informing potential buyers or homeowners of their close proximity to the airport.

Keith Downs responded that an avigation easement (Condition of Approval #1) was sufficient notification to the potential buyers/home owners. He further added that a land division had been amended to denote the TPZ as environmental, as noted in Condition of Approval #4. Upon hearing no further responses, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff’s Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

H. FV-01-113 – Carl Rheingans – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

An additional comment updated the verbiage on Cases FV-01-113 & FV-01-117 from ‘Draft Environmental Assessment’ to “Recommended Noise Mitigation.”

Beverly Coleman advised the Commissioner’s to forward the staff report attachment with noise concerns to the Planning Dept. with additional comments.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-01-113– Carl Rheingans
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Tract Map 30167

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for Tract Map 30167 on 40 acres consisting of 143 single-family dwelling units.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Benton Road, east of Leon Road and west of Pourroy Road, 5,952 feet east of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: *The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. The*

CLUP indicates that residential uses in the 60 CNEL are not compatible. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project.

Land Use: The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the total tract should range between 15% and 20% project, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).

Height: The highest elevation on the site is 1,373 MSL and the structures are not expected to exceed 25 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1500 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. PART 77 airspace obstructions are not a concern.

Conclusion: The residential and open space portions of the proposal are consistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport, and is subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report. (per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: For County utilization

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
4. The land division is amended to recognize the Traffic Pattern Zone in the CLUP and included in the appropriate and graphic illustrations of the Environmental Constraints Sheet.
5. Any acoustical study for the site should include noise from the overflying aircraft within the analysis and discuss mitigations.
6. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Commission: 1) find the project consistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report, and 2) the Commission forward the comments regarding NOISE to the county Planning Department along with any others that the members wish to include.

**RECOMMENDED NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES
FOR USE BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

(per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)

Acoustical Analysis: *The applicant has not yet submitted an acoustical analysis that would address the noise expected from individual aircraft. It can be expected that a noise analysis will be accomplished for those homes affected by the roadway network. Aircraft will typically be flying overhead from 500' to 1000' above ground level over the property. As stated these occasional over flights will likely disturb some residents, be an annoyance and result in complaints about the noise.*

Staff recommends that the Acoustical Report include supplemental information regarding these events in order for the local jurisdiction and buyer to fully understand the nature of these noise events and activities. While the Avigation easement is generic in nature and supplies each buyer with some information, residents near the approach will not be informed of the situation and all those under the approach will not understand or realize the long-term relationship they will have with aircraft utilizing the airport.

Mechanisms to assist in informing or mitigating could be:

- 1. Signage in the neighborhoods of the noise/approach/departure,*
- 2. Additional Avigation easement text describing the specific overflight situation,*
- 3. Notice for the utilization of recipient that the noise from single events will cause the interior noise level to rise above the 45dba in certain situation and times and*
- 4. Additional acoustical treatment to the structures to bring the interior noise level to a lower level (dual pane windows, insulated ducts and vents).*

Additional mitigations to be utilized consist of:

- 1. Additional noise insulation for homes within a single event level of (to be derived from analysis),*
- 2. Additional Notices be given to all buyers that they are likely to be over flown by aircraft approaching and departing the airport.*
- 3. Provision of an additional Noise Insulation Package.*
- 4. Notice to buyers that traffic at the airport will likely double in the near future and may triple.*

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

The applicant's representative, Aida Hercules, Keith Companies came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Ms. Hercules voiced her concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller inquired with Beverly Coleman if the acoustical analysis comment had been stricken. Ms. Coleman responded affirmatively.

Upon hearing no further responses from the Commissioner's, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- I. FV-01-114 – Winchester Creek Dev., L.P. – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations. Ms. Coleman indicated that the noise issued had not been covered due to an ultimate 50-65 CNEL and encroachment upon the project.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-01-114 – Winchester Creek Dev., L.P.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 17020

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for Plot Plan 17020 on 9.21 acres consisting of 175 apartment units.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located in the County of Riverside, north of Bahama Way, south of Date Street and east of Winchester Creek Avenue, 7,900 feet west of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: *The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. The CLUP indicates that residential uses in the 60 CNEL are not compatible. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project.*

Land Use: *The proposed land use is the development of 175 apartment units on 9.21 acres. The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the total tract should range between 15% and 25% of the project, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).*

Height: *The highest elevation on the site is 1,235.5 MSL at the top of the tallest structure. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1,500 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. PART 77 airspace obstructions are not a concern.*

Conclusion: *The residential and open space portions of the proposal are consistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: *For County utilization*

1. *Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *That all tenants shall be informed in an addendum to the lease agreement that the project is within the Traffic Pattern Zone and is subject to noise and annoyance from over-flying aircraft.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commission, upon hearing no response, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

The applicant's representative, Sandra Finn, Winchester Creek Dev., L.P. came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. No response was heard from the audience. Hearing no reply, Chairman Cobb inquired with Beverly Coleman about the location of the apartments. Ms. Coleman responded by providing a location.

Martin Rauscher came forward and voiced his opposition to the project.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff recommended a modification in verbiage relative to Condition of Approval #5 to include the word shall, and read as: "That all tenants *shall* be informed in an addendum to the lease agreement that the project is within the Traffic Pattern Zone and is subject to noise and annoyance from over-flying aircraft."

Earle Newcomber, another member from the audience came forward and stated his unawareness of the airport and didn't understand why he wasn't informed.

Mr. Newcomber voiced his concern about the close proximity of his home to the airport and noted it as bothersome, he made mention of possible lawsuits.

Ken Woolsey another member from the audience came forward, and stated that he had researched the area prior to moving, but wasn't apprised about the airport. He continued on by mentioning selling his home before the property value decreases. Mr. Woolsley further noted that Winchester is the only road into the airport and noted that the new development will cause major traffic issues.

A discussion then ensued between Chairman Cobb, Keith Downs and Ed Adkison, in which the members from the audience were informed of the ALUC's responsibility, rules and regulations, county/city council override procedures, Murrieta annexation.

Another discussion ensued between Keith Downs and Chairman Cobb, pertaining to a notice to proceed, and a protective line drawn around the airport for protection. At which time, Commissioner Tandy suggested that the community members voice their opposition to the Board of Supervisors and City of Murrieta. Commissioner Tandy made an emotional statement of buyer beware.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Graff seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- J. FV-01-115 – Markham Dev. Mgmnt. Group - Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER:	<u>FV-01-115 - Markham Dev. Management Group</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	Plot Plan 17398 and CUP 3360

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for Plot Plan 17398 and CUP 3360 on 4.9 acres consisting of 36,000 sq. ft of retail, including a restaurant and service station.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located in the County of Riverside, west of Winchester Road and north of Hunter Road, 1,450 feet west of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport:	French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area:	Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels:	Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project. The CLUP indicates that commercial uses in the 60 CNEL are compatible.

Land Use: The proposed land use is commercial, including a gas station and convenience market, which requires a conditional use permit. The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan, provided all fuel storage tanks at the gas station are installed underground. Building coverage for the site is approximately 16%, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).

Height: The highest elevation on the site is 1,319 MSL and the structures are not expected to exceed 24.5 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1,500 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace.

Conclusion: The commercial and open space portions of the proposal are consistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: For County utilization

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

- (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
4. *The above ground storage of flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
 5. *Any of the following structures shall be submitted to the ALUC for review prior to issuance of a permit: schools, auditoriums, amphitheaters, and stadiums.*
 6. *The use of helium balloons on exterior displays shall be prohibited.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

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

The applicant's Rep. Sandi Finn, Markham Dev. Management Group, came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Ms. Finn voiced her concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff inquired with applicant as to the type of restaurant. Ms. Finn replied that it was a fast food restaurant, with drive-thru and sit-down accommodations and consisted of two restaurants. Vice Chairman Graff then inquired about the capacity, hearing no response delivered, he voiced his concern with the capacity and proximity to the airport. Ms. Finn indicated that she'd have the information at the end of the meeting.

Chairman Cobb inquired about two restaurants, because the application and stated one. Ms. Finn responded that Mr. Markham was possibly en route to the meeting. Chairman Cobb also inquired about the capacity of the restaurant, to which Ms. Finn referred to the two site plans. Chairman Cobb then asked Ms. Finn to confirm Mr. Markham's appearance at the meeting.

At which time an audience member voiced his displeasure in obtaining the information at the end of the meeting; Kevin McGuire had the community members present in the audience to stand.

Kevin McGuire then came forward and voiced his concerns, after which time a discussion ensued between Mr. McGuire, Vice Chairman Graff, Chairman Cobb, and various other members from the audience voicing their opposition to the project, which consisted of: vehicular and air traffic safety, congestion, emergency vehicle entrance onto the airport, underground fuel storage safety (accidents/hazard), helicopters flight track, weather conditions, residential safety concerns, and school safety, noise and student crossing concerns.

Vice Chairman Graff also voiced his concern with helium balloons used for special events and recommended the addition of Condition of Approval #6 to cover this issue. He also noted his concern with the plan noting one restaurant instead of two as mentioned by the applicant's representative.

The community and audience members (too numerous to denote) were informed by Chairman Cobb in several instances of the ALUC's responsibility, rules and regulations, and directed to their county/city council relative to override procedures. Murrieta annexation.

Chairman Cobb applauded the homeowners on their united front in coming together to voice their disapproval of the project.

Chairman Cobb voiced two concerns he had relative to additional time to obtain specifications and to address Vice Chairman Graff's concerns with the restaurant capacity issue. Another discussion then ensued between Commissioner Adkison and Keith Downs involving the capacity issue, in which Mr. Downs noted that the French Valley Plan was adopted in 1995 and covers TPZ, with no density issues. Therefore, the capacity issue would not be applicable. Mr. Downs suggested a 60-day period continuance. Commissioner Adkison then inquired if anything else would warrant a continuance; Mr. Downs noted the French Valley Airport tour and indicated that the applicant is okay with continuance till the next meeting.

Commissioner Tandy inquired with Keith Downs about forwarding the ALUC's decision to County Counsel. B.T. Miller advised the Commission that the project could be approved, with a letter stating problems, based upon CLUP. He further advised against providing comments beyond the ALUC's responsibilities, and that a finding other than consistent or inconsistent would be inappropriate. Commissioner Adkison made a decision for the Commission to move forward versus granting a continuance.

Chairman Cobb then advised the audience/community members to contact their County Supervisor in 45-days, and go back on 2/26/02 with their concerns.

Kevin McGuire came forward again and voiced his opposition and denoted a gun shop with live ammunition. Chairman Cobb reiterated the plan and ALUC's stance regarding issuance of a permit: schools, auditoriums, amphitheaters, and stadiums.

Chairman Cobb then called for a motion to be set. Commissioner Adkison noted that with the addition of Condition of Approval #6, the project would be deemed consistent.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval, and addition of Conditions of Approval #6, which reads: "The use of helium balloons on exterior displays shall be prohibited." Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- K. FV-01-116 – Telecom Wireless Solutions - Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-01-116– Telecom Wireless Solutions
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PUP00844

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request to install a Telecommunications Facility with a 72-foot high antenna.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located in the County of Riverside, at Joseph Road and Rita Way, 9,200 feet southeast of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ),
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: *The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project. The CLUP indicates the proposed use is a compatible use in the 60 CNEL.*

Land Use: *The proposed land use is the installation of a telecommunications antenna and utility equipment on approximately 22.9 acres. The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the site should be less than 15% of the project, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).*

Height: *The highest elevation on the site is 1171 MSL and the tallest structure is 75 feet in height. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1500 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. PART 77 airspace obstructions are not a concern.*

Conclusion: *The proposal is consistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: *For County utilization*

- 1. Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.*
- 2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
- 3. The following uses shall be prohibited:*

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

4. *The above ground storage of flammable materials is prohibited.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

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

Don Levitz, applicant came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Mr. Levitz voiced his concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval, and noted a modification from 72-foot high antenna to a 73-foot high antenna.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Adkison asked the applicant about the type of tree being used, to which Mr. Levitz responded that it would pine.

Chairman Cobb called for further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. Upon hearing no response from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

- L. FV-01-117 – Redhawk Communities, Inc. - Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-01-117– Redhawk Communities, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Tract Maps 30009 and 30384

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for Tract Map 30009 and 30384 on 148.5 acres consisting of 686 single-family dwelling units.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Murrieta Hot Springs Road, east and west of Pourroy Road, approximately 6,500 feet east of Runway No. 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport:	French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area:	Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels:	Outside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently outside of the 55db CNEL. The CLUP indicates that residential uses in the 60 CNEL are not compatible. While the site currently is not within the 55 CNEL, it is possible that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 55 or 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project.

Land Use: The densities and usages proposed within the TPZ are consistent with the plan. Coverage for the total tract should range between 15% and 30% of the project, which is below the TPZ standard of 50% (gross) or 65% (net).

Height: The highest elevation on the site is approximately 1370 MSL and the structures are not expected to exceed 30 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 1500 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. PART 77 airspace obstructions are not a concern.

Conclusion: The residential and open space portions of the proposal are consistent with the adopted CLUP for French Valley Airport, and is subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report. (per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: For County utilization

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).

4. *The land division is amended to recognize the Traffic Pattern Zone in the CLUP and included in the appropriate and graphic illustrations of the Environmental Constraints Sheet.*
5. *Any acoustical study for the site should include noise from the overflying aircraft within the analysis and discuss mitigations.*
6. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the Commission: 1) find the project consistent with the adopted French Valley CLUP, and 2) the Commission forward the comments regarding NOISE to the county Planning Department along with any others that the members wish to include.*

**RECOMMENDED NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES
FOR USE BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

per comments received from B.T. Miller on 1/24/02)

Acoustical Analysis: *The applicant has not yet submitted an acoustical analysis that would address the noise expected from individual aircraft. It can be expected that a noise analysis will be accomplished for those homes affected by the roadway network. Aircraft will typically be flying overhead from 500' to 1000' above ground level over the property. As stated these occasional over flights will likely disturb some residents, be an annoyance and result in complaints about the noise.*

Staff recommends that the Acoustical Report include supplemental information regarding these events in order for the local jurisdiction and buyer to fully understand the nature of these noise events and activities. While the Avigation easement is generic in nature and supplies each buyer with some information, residents near the approach will not be informed of the situation and all those under the approach will not understand or realize the long-term relationship they will have with aircraft utilizing the airport.

Mechanisms to assist in informing or mitigating could be:

- 1. Signage in the neighborhoods of the noise/approach/departure,*
- 2. Additional Avigation easement text describing the specific overflight situation,*
- 3. Notice for the utilization of recipient that the noise from single events will cause the interior noise level to rise above the 45dba in certain situation and times and*
- 4. Additional acoustical treatment to the structures to bring the interior noise level to a lower level (dual pane windows, insulated ducts and vents).*

Additional mitigations to be utilized consist of:

- 1. Additional noise insulation for homes within a single event level of (to be derived from analysis),*
- 2. Additional Notices be given to all buyers that they are likely to be over flown by aircraft approaching and departing the airport.*
- 3. Provision of an additional Noise Insulation Package.*
- 4. Notice to buyers that traffic at the airport will likely double in the near future and may triple.*

Chairman Adkison abstained from voting on case.

Beverly Coleman advised the Commissioner's to forward the staff report attachment with noise concerns to the Planning Dept. with additional comments.

An additional comment updated the verbiage on Cases FV-01-113 & FV-01-117 from 'Draft Environmental Assessment' to "Recommended Noise Mitigation."

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired if parks or schools were provided, to which Beverly Coleman responded that none were noted per the application.

Chairman Cobb called for further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the

case. Rod Hanway, The Garret Group came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Mr. Hanway gave a project briefing to the Commissioner's, and noted his concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Graff inquired with the applicant if he had any objections to an additional noise attenuation measure being added and payable at the homeowners expense to make them aware of noise issues. He continued by referring to an aerial down wind consisting of two water tanks, in which the noise level will be increased at or near their bedroom windows.

A discussion then ensued between the applicant, Mr. Hanway and Vice Chairman Graff, in which it was stated that an acoustical study had been made that included the attenuation noise issue being built in and also noted dual-pane windows. The discussion continued with Vice Chairman Graff referring to the 45-decibel level stated in Condition of Approval #2, to which Mr. Hanway inquired if this was a supplemental upgrade and at the homeowner's expense. Vice Chairman Graff responded positively. Further discussion carried on in which the applicant advised the Commission that they are the developers and not builders. Vice Chairman Graff clarified that it would be an optional noise insulation package.

B.T. Miller interjected that it was standard for a developer to be unaware of the builder requirements, and noted consideration for submittal to County. Further discussion continued with Rod Hanway inquiring if this meant at Planning Commission level, to which B.T. Miller responded positively, and further added that this would be versus a buy/sell agreement and reiterated submittal to County in the CC&Rs.

Mr. Hanway asked if this was standard disclosure for two miles and noise attenuation, since Phase 2 had not been imposed. Vice Chairman Graff inquired with Keith Downs if Phase 1 occurred in 1994. Keith Downs advised that Phase 1 had come before the Commission.

Rod Hanway then apprised the Commission that the project has been ten year's in the making, and that he is hesitant to answer any statements above and beyond the standard requirements.

Chairman Cobb called for further comments from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no response he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no response or reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Keith Downs advised the Commission that staff is proposing that per diem mileage be reauthorized at the Board of Supervisors after the next meeting.

A discussion then ensued between Keith Downs and Chairman Cobb, Vice Chairman Graff, and Commissioner's Bell, Adkison, and Tandy involving ALUC meeting conflicts and rescheduling dates, with the end result ending in a schedule change to February 28th. Mr. Downs also advised the Commission on the ALUC's move to Housing Authority Building, 5555 Arlington Ave., and stated that the February 28th meeting will be held at this location.

Keith Downs continued by stating that the Senior Homes on Winchester (Temecula and Murrieta) have not submitted a project, though a letter has been sent.

- A. Term of Office
- B. CLUP Updates. Consultant Presentation.
- C. Transportation Commission (CTC) and Technical Committee on Aviation (TACA)
[Copy]
- D. Tour of Airports – Discussion

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

VII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

- IX. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Cobb adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m. and French Valley Airport for lunch and a tour.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: February 28, 2002 at 9:00 a.m., Housing Authority, 5555 Arlington Ave., Riverside, CA 92504.