

# **AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

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

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

## **MINUTES**

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

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman  
Dave Hogan, Vice Chairman  
Jon Goldenbaum  
Arthur Butler  
Mark Lightsey  
Simon Housman  
Roger Meadows, Alternate

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt  
Marge Tandy

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Eileen Allen  
David Flores  
Renee Brooks  
Craig Heaps  
Fred Ponce  
Larry Markham  
Jose Serrano  
Juan Leyva  
Miguel Pera  
Ruben Salazar  
Dilip Sheth  
Leticia Bargoza  
Peter Ganbino  
Tom Evans

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: June 10, 2004

June 10, 2004: Due to the minutes not being available Chairman Stephens continued the minutes for the next scheduled hearing.

**\*CONSENT ITEMS:**

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

Consent items are as follows: BD-04-105 Renee Brooks, MA-04-124 Carter Redish, MA-04-128 Starbridge Communications, MA-04-129 Nextel Communications, FV-04-104 Investment Building Group, RI-04-121 Riverside HDC, RI-04-122 Alicia Cunningham, and RI-04-124 Dilip Sheth.

A member from the audience came forward and informed the Commission to pull item RI-04-124 Dilip Sheth for discussion.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Housman made a motion of consistency, subject to staff conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. NEW BUSINESS

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

A. BD-04-105 – Renee – Consent item see above

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-04-105 – Renee Brooks  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** CUP 3431

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Conditional Use Permit for a produce and liquor store.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 39420 Berkey Drive, south of Wildcat Drive in the County of Riverside, approximately 8,160 ft. northwest of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport*

**Land Use Policy:**

- a. *Airport Influence Area: Area III*
- b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. *Noise Levels: Outside 55 dB CNEL (April 2004)*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 8,160 feet northwest of the west end of the runway and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The proposal is a Conditional Use Permit for a produce and liquor store. The proposed use is an acceptable use in Area III.

NOISE: The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 55 CNEL according to the 2004 noise study Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site.

PART 77: The highest elevation at the site is 113 MSL ft., and the height of the tallest structure, an existing sign, is approximately 45 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 8,160 feet from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 154 MSL will require an FAA 7460 review.

Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.

**Draft Plan:** The draft plan designates the site to be within Zone C and within the 55 CNEL contour. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract a large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
3. Proposed structures higher than 154 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77.
4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.

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

**B. MA-04-124 – Carter Redish – Consent item see page 2**

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-124-Carter Redish (Revision to MA-03-120)  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Plot Plan 04-0371, a revision of Plot Plan P03-0163

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Four industrial buildings totaling **392,000** (301,000) sq. ft. on approximately **19** (16) acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated south of Eastridge between Lance Drive and River Run within the City of Riverside, approximately 15-16,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.*

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted.*

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

- 1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 4. Draft 2004 ALUCP*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposal is for an industrial development on approximately **19** (16.54) acres. The proposed site is located approximately 15,000 ft. north of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the conical surface.*

*The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of*

these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows commercial and industrial land use with a few restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structures is approximately **392,000** (301,000) sq. ft. The lot area is approximately **846,027** (720,482) sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be 42% of the net area.

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

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be 60+CNEL.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. *Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.*
6. *Structures exceeding 1,685 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.*
7. *Subsequent use for the property shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*

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

- C. MA-04-125 – Craig Heaps – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-125 –Craig Heaps  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tract Map 32497, General Plan Amendment 40276 and Change of Zone 40277

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment, Tract Map and Change of Zone from CC to R-14 for a Planned Residential Development.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Orange Avenue, west of Medical Center Drive within the City of Perris, from approximately 17,800 to 18,900 feet southeast of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

*Staff utilized four resources for review:*

- 1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 17,800 to 18,900 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is under a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of an 89-unit Planned Residential Development on approximately 11.85 gross acres. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which requires a minimum of two and one-half acres for residential lots. The proposed lot sizes range from approximately 3,155 to 4,590 sq. ft. The proposed land use designation would be inconsistent with allowed land uses within this area.*

Density and Coverage: *The average gross density is 7.0 DU/acre and structural coverage is less than 60% of the net area.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,439.2 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 27 feet. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 2,088 feet. The project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.*

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be at or near 60 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be at 65 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency of the project, subject to the conditions noted below, based on the findings that:

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the 1984 RCALUP
2. The proposal is under or near the flight track

Should the City wish to override the ALUC findings the following conditions should be utilized, and PUC 21670(a) should be followed per the attached information regarding overrides of Airport Land Use Commission decisions.

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:**

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

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

Craig Heaps, Fidelity Homes came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and made himself available for questions.

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

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

- D. MA-04-126 – Joseph Bulwa – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-126-Joseph Bulwa  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tract Map 32665

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A tract map to subdivide a 1.8-acre parcel into ten residential lots.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located north of Van Buren Blvd., and east of Coyote Bush Road within the City of Riverside, approximately 11,000 ft., west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.*

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

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

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

- 1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 4. Draft 2004 ALUCP*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**



Land Use: The proposal is to subdivide a 1.8-acre lot into ten residential lots for construction of single family residences. The proposed site is located approximately 11,000 ft., west of Runway 14/32. The proposal is within the conical surface.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows residential land use on two and one – half acre lots. A Middle School is adjacent to the north, homes are to the west and east and Van Buren Blvd. is to the south with vacant March JPA lands further to the south. The property is surrounded on three sides (58%) by a suburban density.

Density and Coverage: The lot area is approximately 1.8 acres (net) for Parcel 1. The area of the structures is unknown; however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 30% of the net area.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the structures is approximately 1,738-1,747 MSL feet and the height of the structure is approximately 26 ft. The conical surface elevation is 1,738-1,763 MSL and the runway elevation is 1535 MSL at the north end. Part 77 obstruction criteria require a FAA7460 review.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be 55-60 CNEL.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.*
6. *Prior to recordation of the map, a FAA 7460 review shall be completed for the site.*

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

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

Peter Ganbino, representing the applicant came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and concurred with staff recommendations and conditions.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion of consistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion.

**ABSTAINED:** Commissioner Lightsey and Commissioner Housman.

- E. MA-04-127 – Cingular Wireless – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-127-Cingular Wireless  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *City of Riverside*  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** *Minor Conditional Use Permit 04-0171*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A 55 ft. monopine cellular antenna and wireless communications facility.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 20401 Siegal Ave., at Jacob Dr., within the City of Riverside, approximately 10,800 ft., west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.*

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted.*

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

- a. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- b. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- c. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- d. Draft 2004 ALUCP*

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use:* *The proposal is for a wireless communication facility consisting of a 55 ft. cellular monopine antenna mounted. The proposed site is located approximately 10,800 ft. west of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near an approach and departure track and within the conical surface.*

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

*Density and Coverage:* *The floor area of the proposed equipment structure is approximately 230 sq. ft. Structural coverage will be 50% of the 460 sq. ft., lease area and less than 1% of the approximately 1.6 acre site area.*

*Part 77:* *The highest elevation proposed at the site is approximately 1,792 MSL feet and the height of the antenna is approximately 55 ft., for a total elevation of 1,847. The elevation of the runway is 1,535 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,635 MSL at this location would require FAA review. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed approximately 1,720 MSL feet in elevation. This item requires obstruction review by the FAA and lighting.*

*Noise:* *The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be inside the 55 CNEL. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.*

### **CONDITIONS:**

- 1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)*
- 2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.*
- 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 explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.*
  - 5. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.*
  - 6. An FAA 7460 review shall be accomplished and an obstruction light shall be placed upon the tower unless the FAA will not allow such placement.*

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

Chairman Stephens inquired whether the monopine would exceed the size of the tank. Mr. Downs responded that he did not have that information, but if the tank is higher that is where lighting needs to go, which should have been placed there originally.

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

Tim Fitzsimmons, Cingular Wireless came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation indicating that an FAA 7460 review has been submitted and the height of the monopine tower will exceed the height of the water tank.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Housman made a motion of consistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

F. MA-04-128 – Starbridge Communications – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-128-Starbridge Communications  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Minor Conditional Use Permit P03-0523

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A cellular antenna and wireless communications facility.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at 7260 Marguerita Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 42,000 ft. west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted.

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

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. Draft 2004 ALUCP

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for a wireless communication facility consisting of a 78.3 ft. cellular antenna and equipment structure on the site of an existing park. The proposed site is located approximately 42,000 ft. west of Runway 14/32. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface.

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

Density and Coverage: The floor area of the proposed equipment structure is approximately 302 sq. ft. Structural coverage of the site, including existing and proposed structures, is less than 20%.

Part 77: The highest elevation proposed at the site is approximately 966 MSL feet and the height of the antenna is 78.3 ft., for a total elevation of 1,044.3. The elevation of the runway is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed approximately 2,088 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
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 explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.
5. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.

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

G. MA-04-129 – Nextel Communications – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-129-Nextel Communications  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** CUP P03-0869 and Design Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A 72 ft. cellular antenna and telecommunications facility.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at 5500 Alessandro Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 29,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted.

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

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. Draft 2004 ALUCP

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for a wireless communication facility consisting of an approximately 72 ft. cellular antenna on an existing church site. The site is located approximately 29,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface.

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

Density and Coverage: Structural coverage of the site, including existing and proposed structures is less than 40%.

Part 77: The highest elevation proposed at the site is approximately 1,017 MSL feet and the height of the antenna is approximately 72 ft., for a total elevation of 1,089 MSL. The elevation of the runway is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed approximately 2,088 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction review criteria is not a concern.

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

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.

(Tel. 909- 656-7000)

2. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.*
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 explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.*
5. *The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.*
6. *An FAA 7460 review shall be accomplished and an obstruction light shall be placed upon the tower unless the FAA will not allow such placement.*

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

## **FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- H. FV-04-103 – Zan Marquis – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:**

FV-04-103- Zan Marquis

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:**

City of Murrieta

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

Parcel Map 32123, GPA, CZ 004-057 and CUP 004-062

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone (from SP265/Business Park, Rural Residential to Regional Commercial, Open Space) and Parcel Map for 454,789 sq. ft. of commercial retail usage on 79 gross acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located east of Briggs Road, west of Winchester Road and south of Thompson Road in the City of Murrieta, from approximately 3,150 to 6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*



## **LAND USE PLAN:**

- Adjacent Airport: French Valley
- a. Airport Influence Area: Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ), Extended Runway Centerline (ERC), and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
- b. Noise Levels: Mostly Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for a commercial retail center, to include retail stores, garden center and restaurants totaling 454,789 sq. ft. along with open space/wetlands on 79 gross acres. Based on information submitted by the applicant, proposed structures are located within the ETZ, OSZ, ERC and TPZ. Structures are prohibited within the ETZ. As shown in the attached Table 7A to the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, prohibited uses with the OSZ include hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, auditoriums and uses involving as the primary activity the manufacture or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Uses involving the manufacture or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are also prohibited in the ERC, and are a discouraged use in the TPZ. The proposed use is inconsistent with allowed land uses in the ETZ and OSZ.

Density and Coverage: Based on information submitted by the applicant, 14 of the 17 parcels on the site are currently proposed for development and have a total area of 46.24 acres. The number of proposed parking spaces is 2,338. The remaining three parcels are shown as open space or vacant. Assuming 1.5 persons per parking space, an average project density of 76 persons per acre is calculated. Using UBC occupancy standards for retail stores and dining areas, an average density of 174 persons per acre is calculated. The maximum population density in the OSZ is 25 persons per acre, and within the ERC, the maximum is 100 persons per acre. The estimated population density for the project exceeds the OSZ standard. There is no population density standard for the TPZ. Based on the project site plan, structural coverage within the parcels proposed for development is less than 25% of the net area. This is within the allowable standard for the OSZ, ERC and TPZ. The maximum structural coverage allowed in the OSZ is 25% of the net area. Within the TPZ and ERC the lot coverage standard is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross, whichever is greater. The proposed structural coverage and estimated population density for the project is inconsistent with the ETZ standard since structures are prohibited within the ETZ.

**Part 77:** Most of the site is located within the 34:1 approach surface, although the northerly end of the site is within the horizontal surface. Over-flying aircraft will be coming in low (200-400AGL) over the runway centerline. Structures exceeding 1,439 MSL at the south end of the site would be an obstruction. The highest elevation on the property is 1,355 MSL and the height of the tallest building is 46 ft. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. An FAA 7460 review will be required for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 3,150 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 1,378 MSL at the south end of the site will require FAA 7460 review.

**Noise:** The site will get significant over-flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current 55 CNEL. Most of the site is outside the 55 CNEL contour for 2013.

**Draft 2004 ALUCP:** The draft plan designates the site to be within Zones B1 and C and shows a large portion of the site within the 55 CNEL contour for 2022. An average density of 76 persons per acre is estimated for the project based on the proposed number of parking spaces. Based on UBC building occupancy standards the estimated average density is 174 persons per acre. The maximum allowable density in Zone B1 is 25 persons per acre. In Zone C, the

maximum density is 75 persons per acre. Drive-thru restaurants are a generally incompatible use within Zone B1. According to the attached General Plan Consistency Review for French Valley Airport prepared by Mead and Hunt as part of the draft plan, non-residential uses in Zone B1 and Zone C are a potential conflict with the General Plan designation of Heavy Industrial (M2 and M3) due to the intensity limits within Zones B1 and C.

Conclusion: As submitted, the proposal is inconsistent with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Proposed structures within the ETZ and proposed restaurants within the OSZ do not meet the land use and density standards for these safety zones, and would need to be removed or relocated to meet applicable standards.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
4. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
5. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
7. Schools, churches and uses involving higher densities of population shall be avoided.
8. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

9. Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
10. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner for staff. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Larry Markham came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation requesting a 30 day continuance to work with staff to resolve the inconsistencies.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Housman made a motion of continuance to the next schedule hearing. Alternate Meadows seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

I. FV-04-104 – Mathew Fagan – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-04-104 – Mathew Fagan a revision to FV-03-116  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Temecula  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PA02-0364  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Permit for a neighborhood shopping center, consisting of 160,860 (was 172,000) sq. ft. covering 20.2 acres (gross).

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located east of Winchester Road (SR 79), north of Nicholas Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 9,800 ft., south of the ultimate end of Runway 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 of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for a Plan for thirteen (was 12) buildings totaling 161,680 (was 172,000) sq. ft., on 20.2 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross. The structural coverage of the site is approximately 19 (was 20) % of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the property is 1,097 MSL and the height of the highest building is 40 ft. The highest elevation base for any structure is 1,097 MSL The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,330 MSL at the south end. Structures exceeding 1,352 MSL in elevation at this location will require FAA 7460 review.

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

*Draft 2004 ALUCP: The draft plan designates the site to be within Zones D and E which allow commercial uses at higher densities.*

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

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

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

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

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

J. RI-04-121 – Riverside HDC – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:**

RI-04-121-Riverside HDC

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:**

City of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

Conditional Use Permit and Design Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A 108-unit apartment complex with childcare facility and community building.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is at Janet Avenue, west of Montgomery Street and south of Cypress Avenue in the City of Riverside, approximately 5,500 ft. southwest of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

<i>Adjacent Airport:</i>	<i>Riverside Municipal Airport</i>
<i>a. Airport Influence Area:</i>	<i>Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)</i>
<i>b. Land Use Policy:</i>	<i>Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Plan</i>
<i>c. Noise Levels:</i>	<i>Outside 60 CNEL</i>

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use:* *The proposed site is located approximately 5,500 ft. southwest of the west end of Runway 9-27 and 3,600 southwest of Runway 16-34. The proposal is a 108-unit apartment complex with childcare facility and community building, consisting on approximately 3.9 acres. Structural coverage for the facility is less than 50% of the net area. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

*Part 77:* *The highest elevation on the proposed site is 740 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 35 ft. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation at the south end of Runway 16-34 is 748 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.*

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

***The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone D. Zone D allows 90% lot coverage and has a residential density limit of  $\geq 5$  du/acre or  $\leq .2$  du/acre. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan.***

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (909-351-6113).*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
- 4. The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*

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

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

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

K. RI-04-122 – Alicia Cunningham – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-04-122-Alicia Cunningham  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** CUP P04-0728

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Conditional Use Permit for an elderly care facility on approximately one acre.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is at 3715 Monroe Street south of Magnolia Avenue in the City of Riverside, approximately 8,200 ft southeast of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport  
 a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
 b. Land Use Policy: Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Plan  
 c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 8,200 ft. southeast of Runway 9-27. The proposal is an elderly care facility consisting of a 1,728 sq. ft addition to an existing 3,978 sq. ft. residential unit on approximately one acre. Structural coverage for the facility is less than 20% of the net area. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 790 MSL feet and the height of the structure is approximately 15 ft. The elevation of Runway 9-27 at the east end is 816 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

**DRAFT PLAN:** The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone E . Zone E has no lot coverage requirements. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

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

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

- L. RI-04-123 – City of Riverside, Public Utilities – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Downs indicated that no current recommendation was made on the staff report due to having a shortage of information. Staff has received additional information and letters from the Riverside Municipal Airport Manager, Mark Kranenburg and Caltrans Aeronautics has been distributed to the Commission.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-04-123- City of Riverside, Public Utilities  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *City of Riverside*  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *CEC Docket No.-SPPE-01*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A power generation facilities with an 80 ft., towers, equipment buildings, structures and 80 foot power lines extending 1.9 miles north and east of the airport.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 5901 Payton Avenue, east of Acorn St., and north of Jurupa Ave., within the City of Riverside, from approximately 2,600-3,600 ft., north of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport and approximately 1000 feet west of the extended centerline. The*

power lines extend from the site toward the airport along Payton to Jurupa Ave., and then east along Jurupa 8,500 feet to the substation at Shepard St.

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 2,600-3,600 ft., north-northwest of Runway 16-34 with the 80' exhaust stack at 2,900 feet north. The power line is approximately 1,800 feet north of runway 16/34 at elevation ranging from 825 MSL to 860 MSL. At the runway centerline the elevation is proposed to be 825-835 MSL where the 20/1 approach surface is at 850 MSL. The site is located within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for an 80 ft., tower and approximately 100,000 sq. ft., equipment generator, buildings, structures and storage tanks on an existing vacant site adjacent to the sewage treatment facility. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. Structural coverage for the site, including existing and proposed structures would be less than 50% of the net area.

The adopted CLUP includes a condition for prohibited uses that include those that **'would generate smoke or water vapor or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area'**.

Section 7.3.2 (page 7-12 included) also states that **'Only a few kinds of land uses have inherent attributes that would make them necessarily violate these standards. (Landfills and power generating plants are examples). The plume and updrafts from these need to be examined in some detail.'**

Part 77: The height of the structure is approximately 829 MSL at the top of the stacks. The site is under the transitional and horizontal surface (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the north end of Runway 16-34 is 771 MSL. Any structure over 800 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review. **The applicant has been notified that an FAA 7460 review is required.**

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.

**DRAFT PLAN:** The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone C (see attached analysis from Mead and Hunt (exhibits RI-10)). The proposed site has lot coverage of less than 50% and Zone C allows 80% lot coverage. Zone C requires airspace review for objects greater than 70 feet tall, although the draft plan indicates that FAA review is required for certain proposed construction that does not exceed the height limit. Critical community infrastructure facilities (power plants electrical substations and communication facilities) are not a prohibited use in zone C.

### **CONDITIONS**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (909-351-6113).
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
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 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. *Obstruction lighting and marking shall be place upon all towers and power lines that exceed the obstruction standards of PART 77.*
  6. *Any conditions needed to make the plume situation knowledgeable and safe for aircraft operations shall be incorporated in the operations of the plant.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *At the time of the Staff report (July 1) we have not received: legible full size copies of the plan, the FAA 7460 review, a Caltrans comment, updated plume data, comments from the Energy Commission regarding the plume data and comments from the airport operator. July 7: We have received legible full size copies of the plan and updated plume data and it is enclosed.*

Keith Downs referred to the plume data on the ENSR letter page 2 where it indicates “turbulence generated by the exhaust plumes are comparable (or less) in magnitude than that of the naturally occurring convective thermals”. By the time the plumes from the Riverside ERC drifts over the northern extension of the runway it will be essentially indistinguishable. However we need to know what would happen with the plume in a lower temperature. Mr. Downs then referred to page 4 which indicates the plume rise to be 950 meters and believes it is a typo, but there are speakers with the Energy Commission in the audience that can clarify this. Also the estimate of the aircraft going over the site is said to be at a 100 knots. After talking to the airport manager and a couple pilots it is most likely to be at 75 knots. Mr. Downs indicated this plant is expected to operate between May and October, but questioned whether there is something that would make it impossible for the plant to operate on a cold winter day. It is clear that there is not a noise issue, but there is a height issue particularly for the power lines. Mr. Kranenburg requested mitigation to include the orange balls that are placed on power lines for visibility. Staff also recommends it be added even if the FAA concludes it is not a hazard to navigation.

Chairman Stephens called for a representative for the City of Riverside to come forward and present the case.

Tom Evans, City of Riverside Public Utilities Director came forward in response to

Chairman Stephens' invitation indicating that the City of Riverside brings power into the City from various sources throughout the country. Part of those power sources have contract limits to them. One particular contract the City has for summer peaking power requirements ends in the middle of 2005. The options were to continue using contract resources to provide power to the customers throughout the City of Riverside or build a power plant within the City. This will be the second power plant project. The first was approved by this Commission a couple of years ago, which is located near the March Air Reserve Base. City Council approved to move forward with this project on the basis of having a power plant in the City provide control in terms of price and flexibility. This plant is designed to be used on very hot summer days with respect to meeting consumer's needs. On a typical day customers in the aggregate are using approximately 250-mega watts of power. On a hot summer day 500-mega watts of power is being used. There will be two generators which are designed to produce 50-mega watts and may not necessarily be running at the same time. The permit requirement that was filed with the Energy Commission provides each plant to be operable 1330 hours in the given year. The City makes a decision on whether to run the plant on the basis of receiving power from other resources. Another important factor is having a plant in the City provides an emergency resource in the event something happens to the statewide transmission grid. It is believed this is an excellent project and site, which has already been graded. The site is already an industrial use by virtue that a Regional Water Control plant exists there with existing fuel resource of natural gas. A 69,000 volt transmission line will be built from the site to an existing substation along Jurupa from then to distribute power into the grid and the rest of the City.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for applicant.

Commissioner Housman inquired whether an alternative site was considered. Mr. Evans responded positively indicating there is an existing substation site along the Santa Ana River. The alternative site has a higher elevation and had not been disturbed in terms of grading. The proposed site made the most sense with the existence of the water control plant and the fact that there is an existing fuel line. Commissioner Housman then inquired about an alternate route for the transmission lines. Mr. Evans responded positively indicating the one consideration was to run them along the Santa Ana River. The concern with putting transmission line in the Santa Ana River path is due to fires that have interrupted the ability to use those lines. Chairman Stephens inquired if the City is asking not to have the visibility balls be put on the transmission lines. Mr. Evans responded negatively indicating that the visibility balls are reasonable. Strobe lights on the transmission lines may be more objectionable to the residents in the area and may not provide the benefit that may be perceived. There are transmission lines near the March Air Reserve Base where there are no visibility aids of any sort including the visibility balls. Keith Downs indicated that condition #4 needs to be modified based on Mr. Kranenburg's letter. Condition #4 should read as follows "The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, discretion lighting be placed on the power lines within a 1,000 feet from the center line.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called Eileen Allen to come forward.

Eileen Allen, California Energy Commission (CEC) came forward and indicated that they are also in need of additional information. The consulting engineer will be at the public workshop this morning, which is being held at 11:00 a.m. and will go over some

inquiries with the consultant who generated the plume analysis. Ms. Allen then made herself available for any questions. Chairman Stephen indicated that if there is anyone in the audience that can address the height of the plumes to come forward.

John Baker, Power Engineers came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation indicating that he is not the individual who generated the plume analysis, but has been in contact with the person who did and is familiar with the report. Mr. Baker referred to page 4 of the ENSR letter to clarify Mr. Downs' inquiries of the rise of the plume being 950 meters. Mr. Baker indicated that number is correct and clarified the meaning of that number. On a thermal plume there are two zones; the 1<sup>st</sup>, when it comes out of the stack is referred to as a momentum base and at some point it turns into buoyancy base. Due to the mass of the gases and velocity of those gases it creates a force generation and it primarily rises vertically. Once the momentum dissipates and the plume turns into a buoyancy dominated plume it essentially acts as a regular ambient air at that point. Mr. Baker then referred to the second sentence which states, "Under calm wind speed conditions, the plume will transition from momentum domination to buoyancy-domination at a height above the ground of approximately 67 meters" and indicated the 67 meters being of importance not the 950. Mr. Baker also covered the concern regarding the lower temperatures referring to page 3 last paragraph first sentence which states, "The plume rise analysis, is not sensitive to the ambient temperature range but is sensitive to the ambient wind speed". In the calculations and equations for the plume rise analysis ambient temperatures are not a significant factor. Mr. Baker then made himself available for any questions.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for any one representing the airport to come forward.

Mark Kranenburg, Riverside Municipal Airport Manager came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and indicated that on his letter to the Commission a portion indicates that if the plant would to be constructed he would put out an FAA publication as an advisory. Stating that small aircraft and helicopters flying directly over the plume stack could possibly be affected below two hundred feet above the ground, which is about the 67 meters. Mr. Kranenburg then covered more information regarding the traffic patterns of the airport indicating that staff's report is accurate on the south flow being occasionally used due to the winds. The traffic pattern is mainly on the west side of the north-south Runway 1 6 and 3 4; arrivals don't seem to be very prevalent due to the weather conditions at the airport. However, there are departures off of Runway 3 4 going to the north. Standard practice is that those aircraft typically go to a point of about 300 ft. of the airport Traffic Pattern Zone before they begin a right or left hand turn, which is about 700 ft. above the ground and the MSL is about 880. Chairman Stephens indicated that there are a lot of factors minimizing the conflict between the power plant and the use of the north way runway. Mr. Kranenburg concurred and indicated that the visibility balls are a good safety feature due to the amount of helicopter activity that the airport has. In regards to lighting of the transmission poles based on the calculations given they do not violate the Part 77, they meet the standards. If the FAA 7460-1 review concludes that lighting is not necessary because they don't exceed height limits then possibly strobes would not be needed.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for discussion from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Hogan requested clarification on staff's finding.

Keith Downs responded that staff's concern is the rise and visibility analysis, which has been clarified. Mr. Downs then indicated that to his understanding the cooler it gets the more clouds form. The testimonies from Blythe in regards to the power plant at the end of the runway visibility of clouds is some of a concern to pilots, but Mr. Wolfe expressed greater concern with the rise analysis particularly when the plume was invisible.

Mr. Evans came forward to clarify the plume concerns indicating that if there were a situation of running the plant under 50 degrees Fahrenheit it would be due to a major disaster. At that point the airport could be in a lot of problems without power unless it has a back up generator. The circumstances that have been designed for the plant is for hot summer days. The reason for the involvement of the Energy Commission is due to the plant being over 50-mega watts; anything under would fall under the City's jurisdiction. Commissioner Housman commented on the concern as a member of the Commission in regards to the plumes, indicating that he does not believe visibility is a problem due to the plant only operating summer days. The issue is there will be an invisible plume of hot air rising that a pilot will not see and its either going to lift or turn the aircraft, the fact that its invisible causes it to be a problem. Another concern is the transmission lines. Although they are under the statutory minimum, safety is always a concern. Commissioner Housman then indicated of an incident at the Ontario Airport where an aircraft got caught in power lines at the end of the runway. Although, they were under the standard minimum it still didn't keep an airplane from ending up in the spider web of power lines. Commissioner Lightsey indicated as the project is presented he does not see a problem with the plumes. The only concern is the visibility problem that can be created if the plant is to be run more than the peak time indicated. With reassurances that this would not happen he inquired what would keep it from becoming a continuing plant in the future. Mr. Evans responded that the permit issued only provides for the 1330 hours and if the plant is to be run for longer hours the City would need to go through the whole process in order to obtain another permit.

Chairman Stephens indicated that it seems that most of the ultimate concerns with the plume and visibility have been addressed well and feels fairly comfortable. Chairman Stephens called for the opinion of the other Commissioners. Commissioner Hogan voiced his concern regarding the height of the power lines, not necessarily the plume issue. Although, the power lines will lie six inches below the danger surface it's still a safety concern and would he would feel more comfortable if the power lines were placed further to the north. Chairman Stephens indicated that he does a lot of flying out of the Riverside Municipal Airport and the six inches may not be much of an issue, if a pilot is flying at that low of an altitude they are in a lot worse trouble than power lines. Placing visibility balls on the power lines should be sufficient and if needed or required the strobe lighting can also be included. Chairman Stephens indicated that the Commission is in an unusual situation where the airport operations and safety to both pilots and local citizens is in conflict possibly with the City's objective of having a safe reliable power source, but the Commissions' mandate clearly is to airport related uses and issues. Chairman Stephens then indicated being in favor of the proposed project as it is presented before the Commission. Chairman Stephens then called for further discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of consistency, subject to staff conditions of approval and recommendations. Alternate Meadows seconded the motion with modifications to conditions #4.

Keith Downs amended condition #4 deleting the second line to read as follows; obstruction marking shall be placed on the power line within 1,000 feet of the extended runway centerline.

**ABSTAINED:** Commissioner Housman and Vice Chairman Hogan.

- M. RI-04-124 – Dilip Sheth – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-04-124 - Dilip Sheth  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** CZ P04-0657 GPA P04-0656 and Design Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A 62-unit Planned Residential Development on approximately 2.89 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located on Janet Ave., east of Challen Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 7,200 ft., southwest of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport*

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 4,300 ft., southwest of the west end of Runway 9-27 and 3,600 ft., southwest of Runway 16-34. The proposal is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a 62-unit planned residential development on approximately 2.89 acres (gross). Structural coverage for the site, including existing and proposed structures is less than 40% of the net area. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.*

Part 77: *The highest pad elevation at the site is approximately 740 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 26 feet. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation at the west end of Runway 9-27 is 758 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.*

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

**DRAFT PLAN:** *The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone D. Zone D allows 90% lot coverage and has a residential density limit of  $\geq 5$  du/acre or  $\leq .2$  du/acre. The proposed use is a compatible use under the draft plan.*

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (909-351-6113).

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

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

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner, hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Chairman Stephens stated before taking comments from the audience that the Commission's purpose is to evaluate airport related uses and safety to the public in general and not related to city related land use issues. Chairman Stephens then called Fred Ponce to come forward.

Fred Ponce came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and voiced his opposition on the proposed project in companionship with neighbors that surround the project site. Mr. Ponce indicated that apartment complexes have damaged their neighborhood throughout the years and strongly objected the 62-unit apartment complex being built in their neighborhood.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the hearing that would be more appropriate to attend would be the City of Riverside Planning Commission. The decision that would be made by the Airport Land Use Commission will be how the project relates to the airport in terms of noise, safety and obstruction.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for any one else wishing to speak on this item to come forward.

Leticia Barboza came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and also voiced her opposition with the proposed project.

Dilip Sheth, applicant and project manager came forward indicating that their focus is to clean up the neighborhood and make it more pleasant, also the apartment complex will be a gated community. He then made himself available for any questions from the Commissioners.

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

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

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Commission Member Status

Keith Downs indicated that a resume was distributed for any member of the Commission that has not appointed an alternate for consideration and a letter needs to be sent to staff appointing their alternate.

B. ALUP Meeting Schedule and Location

Keith Downs indicated that a full hearing will be held in Riverside August 12<sup>th</sup>. The September hearing will be in Indio, which at that time the Desert Resort (Jacqueline Cochran) Regional Airport Master Plan should be available. The consultants will be attending the hearing for an overview of the plan.

C. ALUCP Update

Mr. Downs indicated that a verbal discussion has been made with Caltrans regarding amending a grant without obtaining a new grant to obtain the maximum, which is \$500,000. The estimated amount needed is \$110, 000 and 10% is retained. Adding \$80,000 to the grant is probably enough funding to complete the plan. An alternative would be that there is also a verbal commitment both from the County of Riverside and County San Bernardino to do the 10% match for the remainder of the three airports. The County of Riverside, Aviation Department will also loan funding with a reassurance of repayment.

D. MARB Status

Mr. Downs indicated that the Commissions consultant Mead & Hunt has won the contract for the MARB CLUP.

E. Override Blythe Power Plant BL-02-100

Mr. Downs indicated that a letter was included in the agenda packet regarding the override for the Blythe Power Plant.

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

None

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

B.T. Miller informed the Commission that he will not be available to attend the September hearing. Keith Downs informed the Commission of the importance for Counsel to attend the September hearing and recommended changing the date. Chairman Stephens concurred. Keith Downs indicated providing the Commission with calendar of possible dates.

- IX. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 11:35 A.M.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: August 12, 2004 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside