

**DRAFT FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

**ALUC REVIEW OF BOB HOPE AIRPORT REPLACEMENT TERMINAL PROJECT  
AVIATION CASE NO. RPPL2016002601  
PROJECT NO. 2016-000744-(5)**

**COMMISSION HEARING DATE:** July 13, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

**SYNOPSIS:**

The City of Burbank and the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority (Airport Authority) proposes a new Development Agreement and ordinance amendments to two Planned Development Zones to authorize the construction of a new 14-gate passenger replacement terminal and parking garage, along with other airport-related improvements including parking lots, access, storage, and taxiway improvements at Bob Hope Airport (Airport) in order to bring the Airport into compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. Development agreements and zoning amendments are major land use actions subject to Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review for consistency with the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

**PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION:** To be completed after the public hearing.

**FINDINGS:**

1. The State Aeronautics Act Section 21670, et. seq. of the California Public Utilities Code ("PUC") requires every county in which there is an airport served by a scheduled airline to establish an Airport Land Use Commission.
2. Pursuant to Section 21670.2 of the PUC, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission has the responsibility for acting as the ALUC for Los Angeles County.
3. In 1991 the Los Angeles County ALUC adopted the Los Angeles County ALUCP that set forth policies, maps with planning boundaries, and criteria for promoting compatibility between airports and the land uses that surround them.
4. The ALUCP provides for the orderly development of Los Angeles County's public use airport and the area surrounding them. The ALUCP contains policies and criteria, including a 65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour, which minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards.
5. The 1991 Los Angeles County ALUCP includes Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport, which was legally renamed to Bob Hope Airport in 2003 in honor of entertainer Bob Hope. It remains the legal name of the airport, even if it may be identified by other names in other documents.
6. The majority of the Airport property is located in the City of Burbank, with the northeastern corner of the property, which includes the northern terminus of a runway, located within the City of Los Angeles.
7. The Airport does not have an Airport Master Plan, as noted in the Los Angeles County ALUCP.

8. The ALUCP establishes an Airport Influence Area (AIA) for the Airport, which is defined by the airport property, the area with the four designated Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) and the 65 dB CNEL noise contour. The AIA defines the area of interest to the ALUC.
9. Pursuant to Sections 21661.5, 21674(d), and 21676(b), of the PUC, the County ALUC has the responsibility to review for consistency with the ALUCP, airport master plans, specific plans, general plan amendments, zoning ordinances, and related development proposals within the established AIA for consistency with the adopted ALUCP, before final action is taken by the local agency.
10. The portions of the Project being reviewed by ALUC are a Development Agreement and proposed ordinance amendments for two parcels with Planned Zone zoning designations, which are major land use actions as defined by Sections 1.5.1(b) and 1.5.3(a)(3) of the Los Angeles County ALUC Review Procedures (Review Procedures). Additionally, a proposed net increase of more than 40,000 square feet for a nonresidential development within an AIA is subject to ALUC review per Section 1.5.3(5) of the Review Procedures.
11. The proposed ordinance amendments will add or modify uses that are compatible with airport activities on the Planned Zone parcels, such as shuttle service, access roads, staging areas, and parking.
12. The Development Agreement, when ratified, grants the Airport Authority, as owners, vested rights for 20 years to develop portions of the Airport property, including a replacement terminal which may be of the same size or up to 123,000 square feet larger.
13. The existing terminal, which is over 80 years old, is located less than 300 feet from the nearest runway centerline and a Runway Protection Zone, and does not meet FAA safety and design guidelines for airports.
14. Based on Section 21664.5 of the PUC governing airport expansions, the Project at the Airport does not construe an expansion of the airport, but rather a relocation of airport facilities to comply with FAA safety guidelines. A larger terminal is not considered an airport expansion as the number of gates to serve aircraft remains the same at 14.
15. The proposed terminal will not accommodate more or larger aircrafts than are currently served by the Airport.
16. No new runways or runway protection zones are proposed as part of the Project, however new and realigned taxiways within and near the runway protected zones are proposed.
17. No changes to landings or take-off routes on runways or flight patterns are proposed. Changes to taxiing route patterns will occur with the new and realigned taxiways.
18. The Project will not change the Airport's voluntary nighttime curfew affecting commercial flights that take-off or land between 10 PM and 7 AM.
19. No non-aviation development is proposed as part of the Project.

20. Pursuant to the City of Burbank's Measure B requirements, the Project requires a vote by the residents of the City through a general election to ratify the Development Agreement and zoning amendments before a replacement terminal can be built.
21. After the Development Agreement is ratified, changes to the Airport's airport layout plan will be required and will be subject to approval by the FAA.
22. The City has determined that the Project is consistent with the City's General Plan.
23. The Airport Authority has been implementing a 14 CFR Part 150 Study Noise Compatibility Program, which was established in 2000, updated in 2004, and has recently been revised as of March 2016 to mitigate noise impacts from the airport to surrounding areas.
24. The Airport Authority has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project. The EIR identified four Project alternatives (including the no project alternative), and all alternatives were found to have less than significant to no impacts on land use and planning, noise, and hazard and hazardous materials. Significant and unavoidable impacts would only affect air quality. The EIR also identified that the Airport may be growth-inducing, but it would occur due to prevailing economic climate, with or without the Project, therefore, based on the EIR's analysis the Project would have no impact on growth.
25. Pursuant to Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.3(a) of the Review Procedures, the Commission shall determine whether the proposed airport development plan is consistent with the ALUCP. The Commission shall base its determination of consistency on findings that the forecasts and development identified in the development plan will not result in greater noise, over-flight, and safety impacts or height restrictions on surrounding land uses than are assumed in the ALUCP.
26. The Project is consistent with the ALUCP for the following reasons:
  - a. The Project is consistent with General Policies G-1 through G-5 in the ALUCP in that:
    - 1) All proposed uses in the ordinance amendments and the Development Agreement are compatible with airport use pursuant to the Land Use Compatibility Table, and will not negatively affect airport operations;
    - 2) The Airport will continue to offer its current acoustical treatment program for affected residences within the AIA per its revised Noise Compatibility Program; and
    - 3) The Airport will continue to uphold its nighttime curfew per its revised Noise Compatibility Program.
  - b. The Project is consistent with Noise Policies N-1 through N-4 in that:
    - 1) The CNEL levels were used to measure projected noise impacts, and for taxiing noise, Sound Exposure Levels (SELs) for each flight operation were used since there were no established CNEL thresholds to measure shifts in taxiing noise and those SELs were found not to project beyond airport property;
    - 2) The Project will not generate a permanent increase in CNEL levels that is significant;

- 3) The Airport Authority has been proactive in offering acoustical treatments to affected single-family residential properties within its AIA to the point that 75% of the affected properties have been soundproofed in the last 10 years and will expand the program to multi-family residential properties per its revised Noise Compatibility Program; and
  - 4) All prospective property owners are informed by the noise from the airport and that the acoustical treatment program is available free of charge to the owners, per its revised Noise Compatibility Program.
- c. The Project is consistent with Safety Policies S-1 through S-7 in that:
- 1) No permanent changes will be made to the Airport's Runway Protection Zones other than taxiway realignments for efficient taxiing of aircrafts prior to take-off or after landing;
  - 2) No permanent aboveground storage of hazardous materials are proposed;
  - 3) All lighting fixtures will comply with FAA design guidelines and as part of the city's conditions of approval to reduce glare and spillover lighting;
  - 4) All proposed buildings will be below the Part 77 height slope and approach surface zones and will be placed at increased distances from the runways;
  - 5) Activities will be strictly monitored to prevent attraction of birds, such as proper food waste disposal guidelines; and
  - 6) No uses are proposed that would generate large concentrations of birds, emit smoke, nor generate electrical interferences.

**BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION CONCLUDES:**  
That the Bob Hope Airport Replacement Terminal Project in Aviation Case No. RPPL 2016002601 is **CONSISTENT** with the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

**VOTE:**

Concurring:

Dissenting:

Abstaining:

Absent:

Action Date: July 13, 2016