

# **AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

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

**Thursday, March 9, 2006**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## **MINUTES**

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on March 9, 2006 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman  
Mark Lightsey  
Jon Goldenbaum  
Arthur Butler  
Daniel Olson (Alternate)  
Jim Downes (Alternate)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Rod Ballance  
Melanie Fesmire  
Charles Washington

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, Executive Director  
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel  
Barbara Santos

OTHERS PRESENT: John A. Corella, Royce International  
John Guerin, Riverside County Planning  
Ken Brody, Mead and Hunt  
Gary Miller, GMID Architect  
David Kaylor  
Mike Katusian, City of Riverside  
Marsha Vincellete

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Housman.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG
- III. ROLL CALL was taken
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: January 12, 2006

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Arthur Butler made a motion to approve the January 12, 2006 minutes. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

- A. **CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-127- Riverside Commercial Investor's, Inc.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Permit P05-0922, 23 and 24

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

An industrial/office complex consisting of approximately 170,000 sq. ft. on 11.6 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at the northeast and northwest corner of Arlington Avenue and Airport Drive within the City of Riverside, from approximately 300 to 800 ft. southeast of Runway 16-34 at Riverside Municipal Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

- Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C, D, B1 and B2  
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from approximately 300 to 800 feet southeast of Runway 16-34 and 1,900 ft. south of Runway 9-27. The proposal is for an industrial office complex consisting of approximately 170,000 sq. ft. on 11.8 acres. The project site is within Zones C, D, B1 and **B2**. Based on the revised building layout and density information submitted by the applicant, Buildings 13, 14 and portions of Building 9, 10, 11 and 12 are within Zone B1. The applicant estimates the maximum occupancy of the buildings that fall within Zone B1 to be 98 persons on 4.9 acres, or 20 persons per acre. Two of the buildings (Building 13 and 14) are proposed for office use, and the remaining buildings are proposed for manufacturing. Based on the required number of parking spaces for the project (234), the estimated occupancy for the entire site is 351 persons, or 29 persons per acre. Based on the proposed number of parking spaces (492), the estimated occupancy is 738, or 64 persons per acre. The applicant estimates the

maximum occupancy for the entire site is 500 persons, or 43 persons per acre. Zone B1 allows up to 70% lot coverage and an average density of up to 25 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 50 persons. Zone B2 allows an average density of up to 100 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 200 persons. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and an average density of up to 75 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 150 persons. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 300 persons. Based on the applicant's revised building layout and density estimates, the proposed use is an acceptable use subject to noise and height restrictions, provided the density limitations for Zones B1, B2, C and D are not exceeded. This review applies only to the permits/ City of Riverside case numbers listed in this staff report and the revised site plan submitted by the applicant dated September 27, 2005.

**NOISE:** The site will get significant overflight, and is inside the 55CNEL.

**PART 77.** The highest elevation of any object or terrain on the site is 790 MSL and the highest structure height is approximately 31 ft. The runway elevation is 774 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding 35 ft. in height or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 300 to 800 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 777 MSL in elevation require FAA review.

**Other:** The ALUC continued this item in order to allow the applicant to submit the FAA 7460-1 determination. The FAA determination letter has been received by staff and is enclosed. It finds the submitted proposal acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the ALUCP.

**CONDITIONS:** For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Riverside Municipal Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

4. Children's schools, hospitals, day care center, libraries and nursing homes are prohibited in Zones B1, B2 and C. Above ground bulk storage of hazardous materials is prohibited in Zone B1 and B2.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. An FAA 7460-1 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that exceeds 777 MSL, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway and any conditions listed in the FAA determination letter shall be satisfied. The building shall be marked as per if the Airport Manager deems it appropriate.
7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

Keith Downs indicated we received the FAA 7460 review for old business Item A, RI-05-127 and Item C, BD-05-106, therefore both items are consistent. Under new business, Item A, TH-06-102 and Item B, TH-06-103 Kohl Ranch both items requested continuance by the applicant who was not there to represent themselves. Item C, TH-06-104 recommended approval and Item E, Flabob Airport FL-06-100 applicant requested continuance to the next meeting. All items requested continuance or be approved as a group.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to move consent agenda for Roman Numeral V old business, Item A and C and new business Roman Numeral VI, Item A, B, C and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- B. RG-05-103 ALUC – An Amendment to the ALUCP – The proposed change would utilize net acreage rather than gross acreage as the basis on which compliance with the high density option in Zone “D” is measured. Riverside, Palm Springs and Jacqueline Airport. (Continued from February 9, 2006)

**CASE NUMBER:** RG-05-103 and RI-05-141, TH-05-103 and PS-100

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

An amendment to the 2004 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for public use airports in and affecting Riverside County. Jurisdictions affected are: The cities of Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Coachella, and Palm Springs, Riverside and; the County of Riverside and any special district within those Influence Areas. This effort does not apply to March ARB, Hemet/ Ryan or Chino airports. The attached letter and notice has been sent to those airports and local jurisdictions affected by this proposal.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

All areas within Zone D within the Adopted Airport Influence Areas. Affected Airports are: Jacqueline Cochran, Palm Springs and Riverside.

**BACKGROUND:** The ALUC contracted with the consulting firm of Mead and Hunt to prepare the ALUCP in June of 2002 and adopted the new plan for 8 airports in 2004 and 3 in 2005. Fairly immediately staff noticed that utilization of the gross density for the floor of the high density option was sometimes inappropriate for the uses intended.

**MAJOR ISSUE: Density in Zone D**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that; 1) The ALUC continue to take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public for Riverside, Jacqueline and Palm Springs airports, leave open and continue those airports until the next meeting of March 9, 2006.

**Addendum: January 12:** At the last meeting the Commission approved and adopted the changes to eight of the airports. If the Commission adopts this amendment for any of these airports this year there can be no further changes at these three airports until 2007.

**Addendum: February 9:** At the last meeting the County requested a continuation until this meeting in order to return with a more comprehensive proposal for the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport ALUCP. Since this case is only to adjust the Zone D density, plan, any other proposal will necessitate a separate and newly advertised item. These could then be joined prior to the end of the year for the singular allowed change. Any proposal from any airport or local jurisdiction must use the current Airport Land Use Planning Handbook for guidance.

**Addendum: March 9:** These were continued to this meeting in order to allow more time for any companion proposed changes.

Exhibit A: Amendment to ALUCP

Add to section 1.2 *Net Acreage*: For the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan*, the net acreage of a project equals the overall developable area of the project site exclusive of permanently dedicated open lands (as defined in Policy 4.2.4) or other open space required for environmental purposes. In most cases, particularly those involving relatively small project sites, the net acreage of a project will be the same as the size of the parcel or parcels to be developed.

Change Footnote 16 on Table 2A to read: Two options are provided for residential densities in *Compatibility Zone D*. Option (1) has a density limit of 0.2 dwelling units per acre (i.e., an average parcel size of at least 5.0 gross acres). Option (2) requires that the density be *greater than* 5.0 dwelling units per net acre (i.e., an average parcel size *less than* 0.2 net acres). The choice between these two options is at the discretion of the local land use jurisdiction. See Table 2B for explanation of rationale. All other criteria for *Zone D* apply to both options.

The following page (Gross v. Net Acreage Examples): illustrates the difference that the proposal would make for a typical 40 acre residential project.

The attached diagram shows how the density of residential development would be calculated using the net acreage of the site versus gross acreage. The net acreage measurement would be applied to the high-density option in Zone D.

The current policy of using gross acreage makes it difficult for a project to achieve the required minimum of 5.0 dwelling units per acre under the Zone

D high-density option, particularly when a portion of the site must be devoted to open land for environmental, flood control, or other reasons.

As shown in the two examples, both would meet the minimum density requirement of 5.0 dwelling units per acre if based upon net acreage. When measured on a gross acreage basis, however, Example 1 would still essentially meet the criterion, but Example 2 would clearly not comply.

Keith Downs requested continuance for Riverside, Palm Springs and Jacqueline Airport to April 13.

John Guerin, Riverside County Planner came forward requesting the consideration of the net vs. gross density amendment relative to Jacqueline Cochran Airport be continued. Prepared and provided draft proposed compatibility policies for commissioners in reference to Jacqueline Cochran Airport.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Alternate Dan Olson motion to continue Item RG-05-103. Seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

### **BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

- C. BD-05-106 Robert Ricciardi, Architect - Plot Plan 19953 for a 7,740 sq. ft. industrial building on approximately .75 acres. (Continued from October 13, 2005)

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-106 – Robert Ricciardi, Architect  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 19953

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a plot plan for a 7,740 sq. ft. industrial building on approximately .75 acres.

#### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Country Club Drive, west of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 100 to 150 ft. north of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone A and B2, within the approach surface  
b. Noise Levels: Inside 70 dB CNEL

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a plot plan for an industrial building/sheet metal fabrication plant consisting of 7,740 sq. ft. on .75 acres. The proposal is within Zones A and B2. Zone A allows no obstructions; however, the building is placed away from the runway. The proposal is consistent with allowed uses within Zones A and B2 subject to noise and height restrictions.

NOISE: The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building. That may require more than normal construction, which only attenuates about 20dB.

PART 77: Part 77 approach profiles overlie the property. The highest elevation at the site is approximately 52.4 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. The height of the structure is 24 ft. An application for an FAA 7460 review of the proposed building has been submitted by the applicant to the FAA. As of the date of this staff report (10/05/05), staff has not received the applicant's response from the FAA. It has been more than six months since the applicant submitted an application for this project to the ALUC for review.

**Addendum March 2006: The FAA reviewed the 7460 application and decided to do an aeronautical review. There is one for each corner of the building and they are attached. It reviews the process that FAA does when a project is this close to the runway and within the Part 77 obstruction criteria.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends this item be found Consistent with the plan based upon the project's consistency with the other uses.

## **CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- 4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.
  - 5. The Prohibited Uses in Zones A and B-2 on table 2A of the ALUCP shall not be allowed.
  - 6. **The structure shall be lighted/marked in accordance with FAA Circular 70/7460-1 K Chapters 4, 5 Red, and 12.**

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to move consent agenda for Roman Numeral V old business, Item A and C and new business Roman Numeral VI, Item A, B, C and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- D. BD-05-118 – Mirasera – Specific Plan 338, EIR, General Plan Amendment, and Change of Zone for 545,300 square feet of commercial/office and 1,764 residential units on 189.8 acres, north of Varner Road, south of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue within the County of Riverside. (Continued from February 9, 2006)

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-118 – Mirasera  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Notice of Preparation, Draft EIR, Specific Plan 338, General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A retail/office/hotel center consisting of approximately 545,000 sq. ft. and 1,764 dwelling units on 190 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Varner Road and south of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue from approximately 10,000 to 14,000 feet northwest of the runway at Bermuda Dunes Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

|                            |                            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Adjacent Airport:          | Bermuda Dunes Airport      |
| a. Airport Influence Area: | Zone C, D and E            |
| b. Noise Levels:           | From Inside 55CNEL to less |

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE AND DENSITY: The proposed site is located from approximately 10,000 to 14,000 feet northwest of the runways. The proposal is for a mixed use center consisting of approximately 545,000 sq. ft. of office, retail, hotel and 1,764 dwelling units of various types on 190 acres. According to the application there could be 10,569 people on site or an average density of over 56 people per acre gross or 61 per net acre.

Approximately half of the proposed site (the westerly and northerly portion) of the site with two large buildings and 4 smaller retail buildings are located within Zone E. Zones D and C are in the southeasterly sector of the plan. An analysis within the plan in section 4.1.8 pages 4.67-70. As the EIR states, the plan does not meet density for Zone C. Based on the proposed building layout within the safety zones, the proposed density and use is **Inconsistent** subject to noise and height issues. Wildlife hazards attractant have not been discussed.

NOISE: The site will get significant over flight and the eastern portion of the project is inside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. The RNAV GPS 10 approach (see exhibit B) for runway 10 brings aircraft approximately 400AGL at this location, but is not described in the text.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any structure or terrain on the site is 157 MSL and the near runway elevation is 73 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required by the plan for structures exceeding a height of 35 ft. in Zone B1, 70 ft. in Zones C and D, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. An

FAA 7460 analysis will likely be required for some structures, but none are proposed to exceed the Part 77 criteria for obstructions.

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION:** We received the NOP from the county after the document was filed by the applicant. The document does not recognize the 2004 adoption of the current ALUCP and only refers to the old document on page 23 and 28. On page 28 it also fails to include the noise contours from the 2004 plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a CONTINUANCE to the next hearing date (March 9, 2006) in order to: 1) Obtain a corrected text of the Change of Zone, 2) Obtain comments from the airport manager, 3) Obtain comments from Caltrans Aeronautics, 4) Have the specific plan address the RNAV GPS 10 approach, 5) Obtain a more complete Specific Plan document including more detailed mitigation measures and direct staff.

**SECTIONS TO READ:** Comment

Introduction and Summary: ALL

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Section 1.4         | ALUC review not an approval  |
| Section 3.0         | Absent   |
| Section 4.2         | Development Standards  |
| Section 4.6         | Open Space does it meet standards of 4.2.4 of ALUCP  |
| Section 4.1.8       | RCALUC compatibility. Attempts to meet Special Condition of ALUCP 3.3.6 (see attached Exhibit C) |
| Section 5.3.10      | Noise  |
| Section 5..1.11.2.3 | Page 5.257 at 6,550 people differs from application page number of 10,569                        |
| Section 5.3.14.2    | Page 5.290-307 Existing Condition relating to airport (Good Description)                         |
| Section 6.0         | RCALUCP not referenced   |
| Section 8.399       | RCALUC not referenced  |

**ADDENDUM:** February 9, 2006: We have since the hearing received a response from Caltrans Aeronautics and it is attached. Staff met with the project proponent on January 24 and as of February 1 has not received any

additional information.

ADDENDUM: February 8, additional material was received February 2 and sent to the Commissioners. These are portion supplementing the original document that was distributed for the January meeting. Staff has discussions with Bermuda Dunes Airport and their letter is attached. Staff attempted in the little time available to put together some findings regarding the proposal, but a fully assembled document from the applicant is not available at this time.

Staff has discussed with the applicant that any document such as an avigation easement/and deed notice be recorded at the time that the local jurisdiction receives approval for the specific plan and not at later times when the project may be sold or fractured.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the Commission should duly consider all the factors in the proposal and if it decides to find the normally incompatible use acceptable then make specific findings regarding the project.

ADDENDUM: March 9, 2006: At the last meeting the Commission reviewed the proposal and found that two areas of the project could be consistent, but that one was inconsistent with the ALUCP. The applicant has modified the proposal and submitted newer maps and calculations of the densities and they are attached. Due to the very short time staff has not been able to review those charts at this time. More information should be available by the hearing date.

ADDENDUM: March 8, 2006: If the proposed changes are acceptable, staff recommends that the Commission tentatively find the project consistent with special conditions and: 1) Leave the hearing open and continue the case to the next hearing on April 13, 2) Send a letter to the County so indicating that direction and ask staff 3) To prepare findings and conditions for the next hearing. This assumes a complete adjusted document with the changes will be available at that time.

Keith Downs came forward indicating commissioners should have received a revised proposal and staff report for their review and approval.

Ken Brody presented graphs, looked at calculations applicant provided, ran calculations for Zone C, provided copy of draft findings to commissioners.

John Corella (Mirasera) came forward thanking commissioners and staff and the ownership of Mirasera. Mr. Corella explained that they

modified plan and changed the characteristics of the project, moved park to a Zone C area and submitted all documentation to have a positive finding. Mr. Corella is requesting a continuance.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion to continue item to April 13. Alternate Dan Olson seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

**THERMAL**

- A. TH-06-102 – Kohl Ranch – Specific Plan Amendment SP 303 A-2 for various changes on 2,172 acres, west of Polk Street, east of Harrison Street and south of 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** TH-06-102 - Kohl Ranch

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** SP 00303A2

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A Specific Plan Amendment for various changes to the Kohl Ranch Specific Plan (see attached description).

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is situated northerly of Avenue 66, east of Tyler Street and west of Polk Street and from 0- 14,000 feet southerly of the Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport

Land Use Policy: ALUCP 2005

a. Airport Influence Area: Zones A, B-1, B-2, C, D and E

b. Noise Levels: From outside 55CNEL to 65+

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from 0 to 14,000 feet south of the airport. The proposed site is within the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Influence Area. The total specific plan is 2,172 acres. The text of the plan currently does not address the adopted ALUCP for this airport nor does it utilize the Caltrans handbook.

NOISE: The site is underlying traffic patterns the 2005 ALUCP indicates that the project is from outside of the 55 CNEL to over 65CNEL.

PART 77. The surface elevation varies from –120 to –159. The runway is at –120 at the southern ends of the runway.

**RECOMMENDATION:** At this time staff recommends a continuance at the request of the applicant in order for the applicant to develop a text responding to the current ALUCP.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to move consent agenda for Roman Numeral V old business, Item A and C and new business Roman Numeral VI, Item A, B, C and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- B. TH-06-103 – Kohl Ranch – Tract Map 33487 for 883 lots on 279 acres with lake and recreation center, east of Tyler Street and south of 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** TH-06-103 - Kohl Ranch

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tract 33487

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A tract map for 883 lots with a 22 acre man made lake with open space, a recreation center on a 279 acre site.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is situated northerly of Avenue 66, east of Tyler Street and west of Polk Street and from 10, 14,000 feet southerly of the Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport

Land Use Policy: ALUCP 2005

a. Airport Influence Area: Zones D and E Airport Influence Area

b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from 10,000 to 14,000 feet south of the airport. The proposed site is within the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Influence Area. The total site is 279 acres. Many aquatic features are being added to the plan, which necessitates a close review for waterfowl attractants that could endanger aircraft approach in the future. A copy of the newest (July 27, 2004) FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33A is included. It requests the applicant to contact the Airport Operator to develop a Wildlife Hazard Management Plan

(WHMP). The applicant was requested to obtain a USDA Wildlife review for all lakes within the project. The tract has an overall gross density of 3.1 units per acre which is **Inconsistent** with the Zone D requirements for this airport. The amendment made by the Commission in December 2005 to Zone D allows projects with a net density of 5 per acre, but currently does not apply to this airport. The net density is 5.164 per acre for this proposal. If the plan was amended it may be found Consistent after adoption of the amendment to Zone “D”.

**NOISE:** The site is underlying traffic patterns and will experience some annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 2005 ALUCP indicates that the project is outside of the 55 CNEL.

**PART 77.** The surface elevation varies from –153 to –159. The runway is at –120 at the southern ends of the runway. The site is within the approach surfaces, but does not need any FAA review at this time due to the distance to structures and the lower nature of the terrain.

**RECOMMENDATION:** At this time staff recommends a continuance to April 13, 2006 at the request of the applicant.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to move consent agenda for Roman Numeral V old business, Item A and C and new business Roman Numeral VI, Item A, B, C and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- C. TH-06-104 – MSA Consulting – Industrial Parcel Map 34159 for 71 lots on 152 acres, west of Polk Street, and north of Airport Blvd., within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** TH-06-104 – MSA Consulting  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Parcel Map 34159

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A Parcel Map for 71 lots on 152 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is located at the northwest corner of Polk Street and Airport Blvd. within the County of Riverside, approximately 1,300-5,300 feet northeast of Runway 17-35 at the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (Formerly Thermal Airport)

a. Airport Influence Area: Zones B-1, C and D

b. Noise Levels: Inside current 55 CNEL and a small portion of the 60 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is for a 71 lot parcel map on 152 acres gross located from approximately 1,300-5,300 ft. northeast of Runway 17-35. A large portion of the site, approximately half, falls within Zone C of the Airport Land Use Compatibility. A smaller portion of the site falls within Zone B-1 and includes nine (9) lots with lot sizes of 1.29 to 3.29 acres. The balance is within Zone D. At this time no structures are proposed. Zones C and D allow 75 and 300 person per acre and most industrial and manufacturing uses would be allowed. In Zone B-1 the density permitted is only 25 per acre with a list of prohibited uses.

NOISE: The site is inside the ultimate 55 CNEL contour for the airport and a small area of 60CNEL.

PART 77. The highest object or terrain at the proposed site is -107 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is unknown at this time. The north runway end is at -115 MSL. The site is located within the transitional and horizontal surfaces. Structures exceeding -102 MSL ft. at this location would require FAA 7460 review.

CONCLUSION: The portion of the project that falls within Zone C and D should meet the applicable non-residential density standards for those Zones. The portion of the project that falls within Zone B-1 is consistent with the applicable standards at this time, but no uses are proposed.

Therefore, the project as submitted is acceptable; but subsequent projects within the site will need to be reviewed in light of each zones standard.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Commission find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport.

**CONDITIONS (For County Use):**

1. Provide Deed Notices/Avigation Easement to the Desert Resorts Airport prior to any 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 office portions 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. No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height exceeding 70 ft. or a 1:100 slope from the end of the runway.
6. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
7. Subsequent uses on the site shall be reviewed by the ALUC and the uses prohibited in Table 2A shall not be allowed on the pertinently zoned portions of the site.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to move consent agenda for Roman Numeral V old business, Item A and C and new

business Roman Numeral VI, Item A, B, C and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

- D. FV-06-102 – French Valley Industrial Park – Plot Plan 21163 for office commercial, light industrial and Parcel Map 33691 for 70 lots on 82 acres, west of Leon Road and south of Auld Road, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-06-102 – French Valley Industrial Dev. Inc.

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 21163 and Parcel Map 33691

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A 70 lot commercial/industrial parcel map on 82.07 acres and plot plan for 298,400 sq. ft. of office warehouse/commercial buildings on 23 acres of that Parcel Map.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Auld Road and west of Leon Road within the County of Riverside, from approximately 400-2,400 ft. east of the current runway 18-36 and on the proposed secondary runway at the French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

- Adjacent Airport: French Valley
- a. Airport Influence Area: Zones A, B-1, B-2, C and D
- b. Noise Levels: Outside the 55 to inside the 70CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is a plot plan for 298,400 sq. ft. Of one-story office, industrial and commercial complex on 23 acres and a parcel map for 70 lots on 82 acres. The proposed development includes 55 office buildings along with parking and landscape improvements. The plot plan places the site largely within Zone A which allows no structures. The A zone deriving from the existing runway runs 95 feet into the property, but has no structures within this narrow area. The balance of the A zone is derived from the proposed secondary runway and the balance of the

zones are approach and sideline zones from both runways. Zone B-1 prohibits noncommercial densities exceeding people 25/acre. The Zone C at this location derives from the planned secondary runway. A portion of the parcel map is within Zone D at the southeast corner. The occupancy density for the project calculates between 37-64 people per acre depending upon the method utilized. This makes the proposal Inconsistent with the adopted plan for Zones A and B-1.

The parcel map for the balance of the property contains larger lots and has no structures included at this time.

Part 77: The site is within the conical and horizontal surfaces at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,338 MSL. The distance from the end of Runway 18/36 to the building at the proposed site is approximately 500 ft. Any structures over the height of 1,342 MSL at this location require FAA review. The height of the tallest structure is 24 ft. with a highest elevation of 1,376. The proposed structure is within the heights for which FAA review is required.

Noise: The noise contours for 2025 indicate the site are from outside the 55 CNEL to 70CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Commission find the project Inconsistent based upon the approved plan.

**CONDITIONS OF OVERULE:** Should the County wish to overrule. Utilization of these does not make the project consistent.

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 for the entire map including the remainder.
2. A FAA 7460 review shall be conducted and any conditions so constructed. No obstruction of any "FAR Part 77 Surface" shall be permitted and any marking required shall be installed.
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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.
  6. The attached notice shall be provided to all purchasers and tenants.
  7. Have the landscaping and sturtres within the 95 feet on the west side of the plot plan reviewed and approved by the airport director prior to approval.

Keith Downs came forward presenting staff report and exhibits. Mr. Downs recommended Inconsistency.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion of Inconsistency. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

#### **FLABOB AIRPORT**

- E. FL-06-100 Mastercraft Development – Tract 31503 and GPA 00688 for 84 lots on 17 acres, west of Loring Ranch Road and south of Capary Road, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** FL-06-100 – Loring Ranch (Revised)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 31503 and GPA 00688

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 84 (was 93) lots on 54.82 (was 39.3) acres ranging in size from 5,000 to 12,284 (was 135,000) sq. ft. and General Plan Amendment from EDR (2-5) to MHDR (5-8).

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located easterly of the airport in the County of Riverside, from approximately 500 (was 170) to 1,400 feet from the Runway at Flabob Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Flabob Airport  
Land Use Policy: ALUCP Adopted 2004  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zones A, B-1, B-2 and D.  
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55-65CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located immediately adjacent to RWY 9-24 on the north and east. The proposed site is within the Areas A, B-1, B-2 and D of the adopted Flabob Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 82 lots on 54 acres. The proposal has nine lots that are from 2.5 to 3.5 acres in size: and an open space lot at the east end of the runway, a linear lot reflecting the flood control facility and a park lot in the center of the small lots at the south part of the project. The general plan would be changed from EDR (2.5 acre lots) and Medium High Density Residential 5-8 d.u. /acre. The revised map has no residential for the property within 500 feet of the runway and toward the northeast.

The proposal is within Zones A, B-1, B-2 and D. Zone A allows no residential uses or any structures and none are opposed. Zone B-1 allows a residential at a density of one dwelling per 20 acres. Zone B-2 allows residential at one dwelling unit per 10 acres. Zone D allows homes at a density or 5 per acre or more Lots 1-3,10-18,39-67,69-74 and 80-82 are inconsistent with the B-2 designations in the proposed plan. Lots 86 and 90 have portions of the lots that are within a zone that allows a structure or could qualify as infill (see pages 2-18-19 Section 3.3). Most of the project is within the 60dbCNEL and the entire project is within the 55CNEL.

Conclusion: The project as submitted is Inconsistent with the 2004 ALUCP.

Noise: Most of the site is outside of the current 65 CNEL contour for the airport. The site is near and underlying an approach and departure flight track and will experience severe noise from over flying and adjacent aircraft.

Part 77: The elevation on the proposed site varies from 752 to 762 MSL and the height of proposed structures is generally two story or 28 feet. The site is within the approach, transitional and horizontal surfaces. The surface of the runway varies from 750 to 765 MSL. All structures at this location will require an FAA 7460 review.

**CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE:** Should the County wish to override the Commission as per PUC 21675.1 (d) the following conditions should apply.

1. Provide Avigation Easements for the entire proposed development to FLABOB Airport. (909) 683-2309.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which

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

- d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
6. Residential structures on lots 14, 15 and 43 through 64 shall be placed as far away from the runway as allowed by the zoning.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of Inconsistency for the project, but recommends a CONTINUANCE in order to obtain comments from the airport operator.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to move consent agenda for Roman Numeral V old business, Item A and C and new business Roman Numeral VI, Item A, B, C and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

### **BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

- F. BD-06-100 – Marsha Vincelette – Plot Plan 21072 for 90,000 sq. ft. office building, at 38752 El Cerrito Road, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-06-100 – Marsha Vincelette

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 21072

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for an office building totaling 90,000 sq. ft. on 4.68 acres.

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Wildcat Road, east of El Cerrito Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 8,500 ft. northwest of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport  
Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C  
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 DB CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a Plot Plan an office building totaling 90,000 sq. ft. on 4.46 acres. The proposed use will include office/warehouse and manufacturing. The proposed site is located within Zone D. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average non-residential density of 100 persons per acre with clustering on a single acre of 300 persons. The project has a density of 100 per acre overall and a highest acre density of 450 or 500 per acre. The proposal is consistent with allowed overall density and land use within Zone D, but exceeds the density for the single acre of 300.

NOISE: The proposal is outside 55 CNEL as indicated by Noise Impact Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposed use is acceptable in that noise category.

PART 77: The highest elevation of any object, terrain or structure at the site is approximately 164

MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 55 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway (155 MSL) require FAA review.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be found inconsistent with the ALUCP.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
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. 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.
4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.

Keith Downs came forward presenting staff report and exhibits and recommended Inconsistency.

Marsha Vincellete (applicant) came forward and was unprepared for presentation due to just receiving staff report in the morning, but would like item to be continued.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion to continue item. Seconded by Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

- G. BD-06-101 – Plot Plan 21408 for a church east of Washington Street and north of 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-06-101 – GMID Architecture  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 21408

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for a church consisting of one building totaling 187,498 sq. ft. on 4.36 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, east of Washington Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 6-6,500 ft. west of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)

a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C

b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 dB CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a Plot Plan for a church building totaling 16,558 sq. ft. on 4.36 acres. The proposed use will include a 1,800 sq. ft. shade structure. The proposed site is located within Zone C. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and an average non-residential density of 75 persons per acre with clustering on a single acre of 150 persons. The site has 225 parking spaces resulting in an overall density of 78 per acre and 338 per single acre assuming 1.5 people per vehicle. The actual vehicle occupancy will likely be higher. Utilizing the UBC with an occupancy of 623 people the overall density for the project would be 143 per acre and 623 for the clustered acre. The proposal is inconsistent with allowed density and land use within Zone C.

NOISE: The proposal is outside 55 CNEL as indicated by Noise Impact Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The site is under the pattern for the airport and will get regular over flight that will include single noise events that will be of some annoyance.

PART 77: The highest elevation of any object, terrain or structure at the site is approximately 119 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 44 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway (133MSL) require FAA review.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be found INCONSISTENT with the ALUCP.

**CONDITIONS:** to use if the county wishes to override the commission:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
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. 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 concentration 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.
4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.

Gary Miller (GMID Architects) came forward requesting continuance.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum motioned to continue. Seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

- H. BD-06-102 – Emmet Hawkes – Plot Plan 21193 for retail commercial on 1.85 acres, north of Leopard Street and north of Varner Road, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-06-102 – Emmet Hawkes  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 21193

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for a commercial park consisting of three buildings totaling 22,178 sq. ft. on 1.85 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Varner Road, east of Leopard Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 8,200 ft. northwest of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)

- a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C
- b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 dB CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a Plot Plan a commercial/office park consisting of two buildings totaling 17,459 sq. ft. on 1.85 acres. An additional parking structure of 4,443 is included. The proposed use will include office/retail and warehousing. The proposed site is located within Zone C. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and an average non-residential density of 75 persons per acre with clustering on a single acre of 150 persons. The proposal is at 56 people per acre and is consistent with allowed density and land use within Zone C.

NOISE: The proposal is inside 55 CNEL as indicated by Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposed use is acceptable in that noise category.

PART 77: The highest elevation of any object, terrain or structure at the site is approximately 161

MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 30 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL.

Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway (155MSL) require FAA review.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be found Consistent with the ALUCP.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
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. 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 concentration 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.
  - e. Day care centers children's schools, nursing homes, hospitals and libraries.
4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.

Keith Downs recommended consistency.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Jon Goldenbaum made a motion of Consistency. Commissioner Arthur Butler seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

- I. MA-06-103 Kevin Tran – Tract 31809 for 23 lots on 6.76 acres, west of Murrieta Road and north of Mildred Street, within the City of Perris.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-06-103 Kevin Tran

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GPA 03-0382, Change of Zone and Tentative Tract Map 31809

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A GPA, Tract Map and Change of Zone from R-4 to Residential R-8,400 and Tract Map for 23 single-family residential lots on 6.76 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated north of Mildred Street and west of Murrieta Rd., within the City of Perris, approximately 23,000 feet southeast of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Adjacent Airport:          | March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port |
| a. Airport Influence Area: | Within Area of Influence Study Area      |
| b. Land Use Policy:        | Influence Area II                        |
| c. Noise Levels:           | 55-60 CNEL                               |

**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. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
- 4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base and 2005

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 21,000-22,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 23 single-family residential lots and one dedication for public facilities on 6.76 acres. The proposal is under the major flight track and within the approach surface. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which has residential density restrictions of a minimum two and one half acre lots. The proposed land use would not be allowed within this area.

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

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,460 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1,698 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 1,950 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be mostly within the 55 CNEL, the 2005 AICUZ has it near the 60 CNEL. ALUC policy is that no new residential be within the 60 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY with the CLUP. If the City wishes to override the Commission as per PUC 21676(a) the following conditions should be utilized.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notice to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (951) 656-7000
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.

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

Keith Downs came forward presenting staff report and recommended Inconsistency.

David Kaylor came forward representing property owner and to answer any questions that commissioners may have. City asked us to turn entrance around because of the elementary school next door, they did that. The city asked to move entrance to Murietta to eliminate conflict of school traffic and vehicle traffic.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey made a motion of Inconsistency. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

## **RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

- J. RI-06-100 – City of Riverside – Road expansion, signal modification and street lights for Van Buren Boulevard between the Santa Ana River and 500 feet south of Jackson Street, within the City of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-06-100- City of Riverside  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Initial Study

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The widening of Van Buren Boulevard between 500 ft. southerly of Jackson Street and 1000 ft., north of Jurupa Avenue with center median, streetlights and signal upgrades.

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is Van Buren Blvd., 1000 ft. north of Jurupa Ave., and 500 ft. south of Jackson Street within the City of Riverside, from approximately 4,500 northwest of runway 8-26 to 2,200 ft. southwest of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

- a. Airport Influence Area: Zones A, B-1, B-2, C and D  
b. Noise Levels: From outside the 55CNEL to within the 65CNEL

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is within the Zones A, B-1, B-2, C and D of the Riverside Municipal Airport ALUCP. The proposal is for street widening from 4 to 6 lanes of Van Buren Blvd. between 500 ft. south of Jackson St. and 1000 ft. north of Jurupa. Proposed improvements include installation of street lights, a traffic signal and median landscaping which may include installation of trees. The proposed use would be consistent for the portions within Zones B-1, B-2, C and D with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon height issues. Zone A (Table 2A) does not allow any structures except ones set by aeronautical function (NAVAIDS) and therefore any structures in that area would be Inconsistent with the ALUCP. The proposed fixture for most of the project is slightly less than 35 ft., but for the 23 within the RPZ the heights are not determined at this time.

Part 77: The highest elevation along the project 747MSL feet and the streetlights and signals are not expected to exceed 35 ft. The site is under the approach, transitional, and horizontal surfaces at this location. The runway 9 end elevation is 758 MSL and runway 34 end elevation is 748MSL. An FAA obstruction review (7460) has not been performed for this project at this time, although dozens of those proposed will require that review.

Noise: The site is from outside of the 55 CNEL to within the 65CNEL contour for the airport. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive activity.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: If the City chooses to overrule**

1. Provide Aviation 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.
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.

3. The plans for the lights between Jurupa Ave. and Doolittle Ave. shall be reviewed and approved by the Airport Manager.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend a finding of Inconsistency for the project.

Keith Downs came forward presenting staff report and exhibits. Project street lights and signal lights that are proposed are inconsistent with A Zones which allows no structures. Project should be reviewed and approved by an airport manager. Have not yet received an FAA 7460.

Mike Katusian (City of Riverside Public Works) came forward indicating that they do meet the height restrictions and glares to lights. Lights are no more than 30 feet. Mr. Katusian believes they satisfy all height restrictions of the FAA based on the calculations they ran.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion of Inconsistency. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

K. Overrule Notice PS -05-102 - City of Palm Springs

**CASE NUMBER:** PS-05-102 – MG Resolutions  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Palm Springs Overrule  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Draft EIR

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A retail center consisting of approximately 393,000 sq. ft. on 37 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at the northeast corner of Ramon Road and Gene Austry Trail within the City of Palm Springs, from approximately 1,400 to 4,200 feet southeast of the runways at Palm Springs International Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: Palm Springs Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone A, B1 and C  
b. Noise Levels: Inside 60 and 55CNEL

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE AND DENSITY: The proposed site is located from approximately 1,400 to 4,200 feet southeast of the runways. The proposal is for a retail center consisting of approximately 393,000 sq. ft. on 37 acres.

A very small portion of the site at the southwest end is located within Zone A, but no structures are there. Approximately half of the proposed site (the easterly portion) of the site with two large buildings and 4 smaller retail buildings are located within Zone C. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and a maximum average density of 75 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 150 persons. Zone B-1 contains one large building and seven smaller buildings. Zone B1 allows up to 70% lot coverage and an average density of up to 25 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 50 persons. The Palm Springs plan has additional policies added that allow 30 people per acre for the B-1 and 80 for Zone C and additional if more open space is included. The proposed maximum allowable density for the entire site is 1,980 persons. The site contains 1,913 parking spaces which would estimate approximately 2,780 people

on the site. The CBC method would produce about 7000 people. As the EIR states the plan does not meet the criteria for the open space. Based on the proposed building layout within the safety zones, the proposed density and use is **Inconsistent** subject to noise and height issues.

NOISE: The site will get significant over flight and the western half of the project is inside of the current and near future 60 CNEL.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any structure or terrain on the site is 453 MSL and the runway elevations are 395 and 404 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding a height of 35 ft. in Zone B1, 70 ft. in Zones C and D, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of INCONSISTENCY for the project.

**CONDITIONS:** For the City to Utilize if they choose to overrule the Commission as per PUC 21676 (see attached).

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Palm Springs Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.

2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Children's schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, and nursing homes are prohibited in Zones B1 and C. Additional prohibited uses in Zone B1 include places of worship and above ground storage of flammable materials.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. Structures exceeding a height of 35ft. in Zone B1, 70 ft. in Zones C and D, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA 7460 review.
7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

**Addendum: March 9, 2006** this case was heard in October and found inconsistent. The City of Palm Springs has notified the ALUC as required per PUC21676 that they intend to overrule the ALUC. That statute requires that any local agency that wishes to overrule an ALUC must notify the ALUC and Caltrans Aeronautics 45 days prior to that action and to include the findings that they are proposing. **The Letter notifying the ALUC of the proposed Override was postmarked February 14, dated January 23 and received in the ALUC staff office on February 16.** Those findings must implement the intent of PUC 21670.

Alternatives to the Commission are:

1. Make no comment
2. Comment to the findings or facts

The applicant has provided a listing of near by uses (Lowe's and Walmart along Ramon Road). None of these were ever reviewed by the ALUC. The proposed overrule does attempt to explain the *nexus* between the action and 'minimizing the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards, but the Airport Land Use Handbook does not enter into the findings, discussion and usage as required by CEQA (Public Resources Code 21096).

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion to receive and file and have staff notify the appropriate agencies (Caltrans). Alternate Jim Downes seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

L. Overrule Notice RI-03-145 – City of Riverside

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-03-145-Adkan Engineers

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Tract Map 31542

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

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

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated north and south of Jurupa Avenue and west of Van Buren Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 720 to

4,000 ft. west of the west end of Runway 9-27 for Riverside Airport. The site is underlying an approach and departure flight track centerline.

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

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

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

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

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

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

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

OSZ are consistent with the CLUP, subject to the Conditions of Approval.

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport. (909) 351-6113
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels and a noise reduction level (SRL) of 25.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plan should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

6. The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
7. Subsequent permits for uses within the site shall be reviewed by the ALUC prior to approval by the City. Any noise sensitive use within the site shall have an acoustical noise study completed prior to that review.
8. Structures and uses in the Outer Safety Zone shall be restricted as outlined the attached matrix (Table 12) from the CLUP.

**Addendum: March 9, 2006** this case was heard in January 2004 and found Inconsistent. The City of Riverside has notified the ALUC as required per PUC21676 that they intend to overrule the ALUC. That statute requires that any local agency that wishes to overrule an ALUC must notify the ALUC and Caltrans Aeronautics 45 days prior to that action and to include the findings that they are proposing. There is no evidence that the overrule was sent to Caltrans. The letter notifying the ALUC of the proposed override was postmarked February 27, dated February 24 and received in the ALUC office on March 1. Those findings must implement the intent of PUC 21670. The findings attempt to classify the project as infill in part and the proposal has been changed from the original design.

Alternatives to the Commission are:

1. Make no comment
2. Comment to the findings or facts

The applicant has provided a description of the overrule findings. The proposed overrule does attempt to explain the *nexus* between the action and ‘minimizing the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards, but the Airport Land Use Handbook does not enter into the findings, discussion and usage as required by CEQA (Public Resources Code 21096).

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion to receive and file and have staff notify the appropriate agencies (Caltrans). Alternate Jim Downes seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

M. Overrule Notice RI-05-130 – City of Riverside

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-130- Friends of Riverside Airport  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** TTM 31541

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A subdivision for 58 single-family residential lots on approximately 42 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north and south of Jurupa Avenue, east of Crest Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 3,000 to 5,000 ft. west of Runway 9-27 at Riverside Municipal Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C, B1  
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from approximately 3,000 to 5,000 ft. west of Runway 9-27. The proposal is a subdivision for 58 single-family residential lots and 15 acres of open space on approximately 42 acres, with residential lot sizes ranging from approximately 7,000 to 20,700 sq. ft. The project site is primarily within Zone C, although a small portion of the east end of the site appears to fall within Zone B1. The maximum residential density within Zone C is .2 units per acre, or 5 acre average lot size. The maximum residential density within Zone B1 is .05 units per acre, or 20 acre average lot size. The proposed residential density is inconsistent with the density limits for Zones C and B1.

NOISE: The site will get significant overflight, and is inside 55CNEL.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any object or terrain on the site is 740 MSL and the highest structure height is expected to be 28 ft. The runway elevation is 816 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding 70 ft. in height (35 ft. within Zone B1) or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 3,000 from the runway, structures exceeding 846 MSL in elevation require FAA review.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for the project based on the proposed residential density within Zones C and B1.

The following conditions should be utilized in the event the City plans to overrule the project. The use of these conditions will not make the project consistent.

**CONDITIONS:**

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

**Addendum: March 9, 2006** this case was heard in October and found Inconsistent. The City of Riverside has notified the ALUC as required per PUC21676 that they intend to overrule the ALUC. That statute

requires that any local agency that wishes to overrule an ALUC must notify the ALUC and Caltrans Aeronautics 45 days prior to that action and to include the findings that they are proposing. There is no evidence that the overrule was sent to Caltrans. The Letter notifying the ALUC of the proposed Override was postmarked February 27, dated February 24 and received in the ALUC office on March 1. Those findings must implement the intent of PUC 21670. The findings attempt to classify the project as infill and an extension of infill.

Alternatives to the Commission are:

1. Make no comment.
2. Comment to the findings or facts.

The applicant has provided a description of the overrule findings. The proposed overrule does attempt to explain the *nexus* between the action and ‘minimizing the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards, but the Airport Land Use Handbook does not enter into the findings, discussion and usage as required by CEQA (Public Resources Code 21096).

Keith Downs came forward indicating all three overrule notices were found Inconsistent. All cases have not yet sent a letter to Caltrans.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion to receive and file and have staff notify the appropriate agencies (Caltrans). Alternate Jim Downes seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### **AGENDA ITEM:** VII. A.

**SUMMARY:** Procedural update: At the last meeting two of the commissioners requested that a brief session be included to familiarize the Commission with the purpose, mission, operation, funding, procedures and policies of the Commission.

**BACKGROUND:** **While the law and purpose have not changed,** over the last 16 months the Commission has adopted 10 new plans, new bylaws and a set of policies that have changed. Staff will go over these with the attached information at this meeting. **Members should ask that their alternates attend if they think this is of value. Due to the long meeting, this did not happen in February.**

Ken Brody from Mead and Hunt presented maps and compatibility zones; noise contours/risk contours and compatibility factors for the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

**AGENDA ITEM:** VII. B.

**SUMMARY:** March Operations Assurance Task Force and Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)/ALUCP

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Task force to assist Continuing Operations at March Air Reserve Base (MOATF)

**BACKGROUND:** As approved at the May 2003 ALUC meeting, your staff has attended the meetings of the March Operations Assurance Task Force (MOATF) an effort to retain the airfield during the Base Realignment process.

To that end the JPA obtained funding from the Office of Economic Assistance to develop a Joint Land Use Study JLUS and update the CLUP. The March JPA has applied for and received the grant. Staff is participating in that effort on the Technical Subcommittee. The contract was approved by the March JPA on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

Meetings of the MOATF were held on November 1, 2004, December 13<sup>th</sup>, February 14<sup>th</sup> and April 4<sup>th</sup>. A meeting has been scheduled for the MOATF on **February 27**, but staff was not able to attend and their proposed schedule is attached.

The effort is dependant upon noise contours being developed by the Air Force as part of a new AICUZ, which was released September 20<sup>th</sup>. An internal Draft of the plan was given out in April and the planning staff (TAC) of the affected jurisdictions met on April 26<sup>th</sup> and as recently of January 26<sup>th</sup>. The attached April letter was sent to the March JPA regarding that draft. No additional flight radar paths have been obtained, but controversy has ensued regarding a displayed flight track. Staff gave a summary of the current status of the plan at this meeting along with some illustrations and questions about the plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Continue to follow the progress with updates at each meeting.

Keith Downs voiced there was a meeting of the NYPF subcommittee on January 27.

**AGENDA ITEM:** VII. C.

**SUMMARY:** Stipend for Commissioners

**BACKGROUND:** In the distant past (pre-1995) the Commissioners received a stipend for services at the Commission. During the economic turndown of the early 90's it was eliminated. Typically these are a set amount for the day or half day.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission requested staff including counsel to investigate the possibilities of reinstating the stipend. This will need to be continued, since it will require more research to respond.

Keith Downs and B.T. Miller recommended moving to next month.

**AGENDA ITEM:** VII. D.

**SUMMARY:** Letter to all cities

**BACKGROUND:** We have adopted 10 of the 13 and have informed the planning departments of the new maps and the requirements of ALUC review. Some of the jurisdiction are not following are seemingly not aware of the procedure and law. The attached letter was sent by the Chairman of the ALUC in 2001. We are recommending and some airports are requesting that a new letter be sent to all affected jurisdictions. At the last meeting the Commission directed the chairman to forward a letter.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The attached letter was sent to all cities and the county.

Keith Downs indicated that letters were signed and sent out last week.

**AGENDA ITEM:** VII. E.

**SUMMARY:** ALUCP Update

**BACKGROUND:** Chino Airport Master Plan: The San Bernardino airport staff has approved a contract for additional environmental work at the airport and it was completed and copies of the plan were given to the commissioner's at the November meeting. Your staff has asked that additional information be supplied and a response from the San Bernardino ALUC is available prior to any hearing of the Master Plan by the Riverside County ALUC. A draft of the relevant factors has been prepared and staff met with the San Bernardino County airport's staff (July 27, 2005) for review and comment. Comments were received on October 3<sup>rd</sup> and the consultant has finished the plan at this time. It has been placed on the website at this time and was scheduled for public hearing on February 9, 2006. Due to an error in the advertisement it has been readvertised for April 13.

Hemet/Ryan Airport: The status is unchanged. A draft Master Plan has been completed and the initial study was sent out by the airport sponsor for comments and ultimate scheduling for the ALUC review after the comment period ended (September 15, 2004) and prior to any Board of Supervisor's hearing. The County has indicated that some individuals and the City of Hemet and RCTC have requested that an EIR be prepared for the Hemet Master Plan. The County and City of Hemet have had discussion regarding adding the street replacements to the effort and a Notice of Preparation will be completed soon. After adoption of the Master Plan by the Board of Supervisors the update for this airport could go to hearing. A new alternative of an addition to the original plan of an extension to 6,000 feet may be added to the plan. The background information for the airport is now on the website.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Information only  
Keith Downs indicated that Chino Airport was readvertised to April 13<sup>th</sup>.  
Hemet/Ryan Airport CDF is going to stay there, so county will reconfigure their efforts to do a new master plan after which there will be an update to the ALUCP.

**AGENDA ITEM:** VII. G.

**HEARING DATE:** March 9, 2006

**CASE SUMMARY:** County request for amendment to FVALUCP

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** County letter January 21, (received January 23) requesting amendment to adopted French Valley plan.

**BACKGROUND:** This letter was received on January 23 prior to the judicial hearing regarding the Silverhawk complaint. At the last hearing the Commission directed staff to review the proposal and report back to the Commission with a recommendation regarding the request. Staff directed our consultant to review the proposal and his review is attached. In light of the judicial hearing, it may be inappropriate and inefficient to act until that is fully resolved. Three issues need to be resolved:

1. Finance: who will fund the changes proposed. Our fees cover the individual cases and not those requested by airports or local jurisdictions.
2. Environmental review: If we do other than the Notice of Exemption it will cause additional costs.
3. Silverhawk case: Needs to be resolved.
4. Actual request. Much of the county's proposal seems directed to include residential in the C Zone. This is inconsistent with the guidelines of the Handbook.

Attachments: January 21, letter received January 23

Keith Downs discussed: 1) Proposal for amendment 2) Environmental Review and 3) French Valley to be continued until issue is resolved.

John Guerin Riverside County Planning Department came forward and provided supplemental information on the French Valley Compatibility Plan to the commissioners. Mr. Guerin supports staff and their recommendations for continuance.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum motioned to continue Item G. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM:** VII. H.

**SUMMARY:** Wildlife attractant mitigation study for Coachella Valley airports.

**BACKGROUND:** In early 2005 two cases in the desert area near Bermuda Dunes and Jacqueline Cochran Airports made it apparent that a more detailed process need to be available to proponents near the airports to mitigate the potential of hazards associated with wildlife hazards around those airports. The staff asked, and the commission agreed that a study to bring greater detail to the problem. After identifying funds the consultant for the ALUCP (Mead and Hunt prepared a work scope that includes this work. A subconsultant was brought in to complete the task. A status report is attached.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Status Report only.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA

NONE

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Jim Downes will be out of the country next month, and Melanie Fesmire will also not be present.

Chairman Housman attended a seminar in Palm Springs and learned different ways of measuring noise.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Conference with legal counsel regarding existing litigation (Government Code section 54956.9): Silverhawk Land & Acquisitions, LLC v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission et al. (Riverside Superior Court case no. RIC 431176).

Continue to the next hearing date on April 13, 2006

- XI. ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Arthur Butler adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m., seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: April 13, 2006 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.