



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

---

November 24, 2015

TO: Pat Modugno, Chair  
Stephanie Pincetl, Vice Chair  
Doug Smith, Commissioner  
David W. Louie, Commissioner  
Curt Pedersen, Commissioner

FROM: Carmen Sainz, Supervising Regional Planner  
Community Studies East Section

**PROJECT NO. R2012-02527-(1,5) / ADVANCE PLANNING CASE NO. 201200009 / ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO. 201500129; AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION REVIEW OF THE BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN; DECEMBER 09, 2015 - ITEM NO. 4**

At your public hearing meeting on December 09, 2015, your Commission, as the Airport Land Use Commission, will hold a public hearing to consider adoption of the Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and associated Negative Declaration.

Please find attached the staff report and related documents for the above referenced project attached. Project materials are also available online at <http://planning.lacounty.gov/brackett>.

If you have any questions regarding this project, please do not hesitate to contact me at [csainz@planning.lacounty.gov](mailto:csainz@planning.lacounty.gov) or (213) 974-6425, Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

CS:de



**STAFF REPORT**  
**BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN**  
**PROJECT NO. R2012-02527-(1,5) / ADVANCE PLANNING CASE NO. 201200009 /**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO. 201500129**

## **PROJECT**

### **Overview**

The proposed project is an update to the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan by adoption of the Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("ALUCP"). Pursuant to section 21675 of the Public Utilities Code (PUC) Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)s are required to:

...“formulate an airport land use compatibility plan that will provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission, and will safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general. The commission airport land use compatibility plan shall include and shall be based on a long-range master plan or an airport layout plan, as determined by the Division of Aeronautics of the Department of Transportation, which reflects the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next 20 years. In formulating an airport land use compatibility plan, the commission may develop height restrictions on buildings, specify use of land, and determine building standards, including soundproofing adjacent to airports, within the planning area.”

The ALUCP is intended to ensure that future land use development in the area surrounding Brackett Field Airport will be compatible with the airport's current and future aircraft activity. The ALUCP establishes criteria and other policies focusing on compatibility with regard to noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight concerns. The ALUCP will serve as a tool for use by the ALUC to review plans, regulations or other planning actions within the airport influence area (AIA). Additionally, local agencies whose General Plan has been deemed consistent with the ALUCP by ALUC, will use their newly adopted General Plan to review land use projects located within their jurisdictions and the Airport Influence Area (AIA) for consistency with the polices of the ALUCP.

### **Location**

Brackett Field Airport is located within the San Gabriel Valley of eastern Los Angeles County, 25 miles east of downtown Los Angeles. While the airport property lies predominantly within the City of La Verne, lands immediately beyond the eastern and western ends of the runways fall within the jurisdictions of the cities of Pomona and San Dimas, respectively. Other jurisdictions within the ALUCP project area are Claremont and Glendora. Small portions of Covina and Walnut lie along the outer edge of the project area. The Airport Location Map (*Exhibit 1*) depicts the airport area and jurisdictions within and near the Brackett Field AIA, which is defined by the outer edge of the airspace protection surfaces for the airport established in accordance with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulation.

### **Setting**

The terrain of the project area is mostly flat from the northeast to the southeast. The base of San Gabriel Mountains is located four miles to the north and low hills are located to the northwest and southwest.

Most of Brackett Field Airport's surroundings are heavily urbanized. The major exceptions are to the southwest and Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park, Puddingstone Reservoir, and Mountain Meadows Golf Course are located to the south. Also, to the east is the Los Angeles County Fairplex which includes large areas of paved parking lots. During the annual fair and other major events, the entire fairgrounds are intensively occupied. The most intensive year-round uses nearby are in the downtowns and old towns of the City of San Dimas to the northwest and City of La Verne to the northeast of the airport. *Exhibit 9A* is a map that depicts existing land uses within the AIA.

### **Airport Operation**

Los Angeles County owns the airport property and major facilities. Overall responsibility for the airport rests with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Aviation Division. The Aviation Division currently contracts day-to-day management and operation of the facility to a private enterprise, American Airports Corporation.

### **ALUCP Description**

There are four major components to the ALUCP: the Compatibility Policy Zones map (*Map 2A*), Basic Compatibility Criteria table (*Table 2A*), the compatibility policies and the Site-Specific Exceptions and associated map (*Map 2C*).

The Compatibility Policy Zones map divides the AIA into seven zones (A to E). The Compatibility Zone Delineation table (*Table 2B*) assigns a noise impact and safety risk level to each zone with the highest risk zones, beginning with Zone A, located near the airport and the lower risk zones, ending in Zone E, located the furthest away from the airport. Additionally, the Compatibility Zone Delineation table identifies impact factors used to assign risk levels for the zones.

For each Compatibility Zone, the Basic Compatibility Criteria table identifies compatibility and conditions for new land uses, and sets intensity limits.

The ALUCP includes polices to mitigate noise, safety, airspace protection and overflight concerns. The purpose of noise policies is to avoid establishing noise-sensitive land uses in the portions of the airport environs that are exposed to significant levels of aircraft noise. The intent of land use safety compatibility policies is to minimize the risks associated with an off-airport aircraft accident or emergency landing. Airspace protection compatibility policies are intended to prevent the introduction of land use features that can pose hazards to the airspace required by aircraft in flight and have the potential for causing an aircraft accident

The ALUCP identifies three areas that warrant special treatment. These areas are Old Town La Verne, Los Angeles County Fairplex and University of La Verne Campus West and are identified on the Site-Specific Exception Areas (*Map 2C*). They warrant special treatment for the following reasons:

- The Old Town La Verne site is located near two commuter rail stations. The Old Town La Verne Specific Plan proposes redevelopment of this area from low-intensity nonresidential uses (mostly auto parking and mini-storage) to high-intensity, transit-oriented commercial, office, hotel, and residential uses. The site specific policies for this area are intended to remove any potential displacement that could result from the ALUCP.
- The Fairplex Association proposes redeveloping various portions of the Fairplex into more intensive uses potentially including: replacement of the horse racing track with a multi-use stadium; hotel and conference facilities; office space reusing existing horse barns; and, east of White Avenue, a shopping center. The site specific policies for this area are intended to allow proposed projects while minimizing airport related impacts.
- The University of La Verne Master Plan allows housing for up to 5,000 graduate students, a business park, and/or single- or multi-family residential in the southern part of the site. The site specific policies for this area are intended to remove any potential displacement that could result from the ALUCP. Displacement is defined as inadvertently shifting future development to less restrictive areas of the AIA or to other parts of the community where there are no ALUCP restrictions.

Policies in Section 2.7 provide flexibility in the ALUCP to allow the aforementioned development in the Site-Specific Exception areas.

### **ALUCP Preparation**

As required by state law, the primary guidelines for preparation of compatibility plans are contained in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook) published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics. However, the Handbook is not regulatory in nature and it does not constitute formal state policy except to the extent that it explicitly refers to state laws. Rather, its guidance is intended to serve as the starting point for compatibility planning for areas around airports. The policies and maps in the ALUCP rely upon the guidance provided by the current October 2011, edition of the Handbook.

State law (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)) dictates that airport land use compatibility plans be based upon an adopted airport master plan or an airport layout plan, as determined by the Division of Aeronautics. The last master plan for Brackett Field was prepared in 1992. Proposed facility improvements envisioned by the 1992 master plan are relatively minor in terms of implications for land use compatibility planning. Some of the identified improvements have been completed. Among the ones remaining are widening of the primary runway from its current 75 feet to 100 feet. Construction of additional aircraft hangars and other building area facilities is also indicated. No changes to the instrument approach capabilities are proposed.

In contrast, the airport layout plan drawing has been updated on several occasions since that time. The most recent Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved airport layout plan, dated February 2003, was submitted to Caltrans and accepted by that agency for compatibility planning purposes in May 2013 and has been used as the basis for this ALUCP. Subsequent updates—the latest in April 2010—have been prepared to reflect completed construction, but have not been formally submitted for FAA approval.

In addition to the requirement that a compatibility plan be based upon the adopted airport master plan or airport layout plan, the Public Utilities Code says that a compatibility plan must reflect “the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next 20 years.” Because the Brackett Field Airport Master Plan has not been updated to reflect current and proposed airport operations, it is no longer relevant for compatibility planning purposes. Therefore, new forecasts were developed to take into account the above guidance and the historical activity at the airport. The resulting forecast used for the ALUCP assumes that Brackett Field could experience as much as 180,000 aircraft operations, though not more than this, within the 20-year planning time frame. This activity level is approximately double that of 2014, but more than 100,000 operations less than the 1990 historical high of nearly 290,000 operations. The Airport Activity Data Summary (*Exhibit 4*) summarizes airport activity.

To provide input to the plan development, a working group was formed that included staff of the County Department of Public Works Aviation Division as the airport owner, the County Chief Executive Office as owner of the Los Angeles County Fairplex facility, the Fairplex Association as operator of the Fairplex facility, representatives of the planning departments of the affected cities, and staff of the California Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division. The group met on several occasions during the course of the project. Additionally, ALUC staff conducted a series of meetings with local airport and homeowners groups and others having an interest in the outcome of the planning process. The ALUC was apprised of the status of the ALUCP preparation and community outreach throughout this period.

The ALUCP was partially funded by a CalTrans Acquisition and Development grant. The terms of the agreement with CalTrans require that the County complete the project by December 31, 2015. If however, more time is needed to address any commission questions, CalTrans has approved an extension of the term to January 31, 2016.

## CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

### Overview

Government Code Section 65302.3(a) requires that local jurisdiction's general and specific plans be consistent with the ALUCP. A general or specific plan does not need to be identical with an ALUCP in order to be consistent with it. To meet the consistency test, a general or specific plan must do two things:

1. It must avoid direct conflicts with compatibility planning criteria; and
2. It must specifically address compatibility planning issues, either directly or through reference to a zoning ordinance or other policy document.

The following plans exist within the study area:

- City of Claremont – General Plan
- City of Covina – General Plan
- City of Glendora – Community Plan
- City of La Verne – General Plan
  - Old Town La Verne Specific Plan (Fairplex – Transit-Oriented Development)
  - Arrow Corridor Specific Plan
- City of Pomona – General Plan
  - Pomona Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan
  - Pomona Valley Medical Center Specific Plan
  - Pomona Corridors Specific Plan
- City of San Dimas – General Plan
- County of Los Angeles – General Plan
- University of La Verne Master Plan/Update
- Brackett Field Airport Master Plan
- Brackett Field Airport Layout Plan

### Policies

The Airfield Environs Information (*Exhibit 8*) includes a summary of applicable local jurisdictions' general and community plan policies. With the recent revision to the Site-Specific Exceptions of Section 2.7 (see Environmental Determination section below), the general and community plan policies for the County Los Angeles and the Cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona and San Dimas should not directly conflict with the proposed ALUCP.

### Land Use

In order to attain general plan consistency with the proposed ALUCP, no direct conflicts should exist between planned land uses shown on a local jurisdiction's general plan land use map and the proposed ALUCP criteria. A summary of land use consistency findings for the affected local jurisdictions are located in Initial Study Exhibits 5 through 7 which generally conclude that no conflicts between the ALUCP's compatibility criteria and local jurisdictions' land use designations are anticipated.

### Local Agencies Responsibilities

State law (Government Code Section 65302.3) requires each local agency having jurisdiction over land uses within an ALUC's planning area, also referred to as the AIA, to modify its general plan and any affected specific plans to be consistent with the ALUCP. The law states that the local agency must take this action within 180 days of ALUCP adoption or amendment. The only other course of action available to local agencies is to overrule the ALUC by, among other things, a two-thirds vote of its governing body after making findings that the agency's plans are consistent with the intent of state airport land use planning statutes (Public Utilities Code Section 21676(b)). No direct conflicts exist between the proposed ALUCP policies and the general plan policies adopted by the local agencies addressing airport land use compatibility matters (*see Initial Study Exhibit 1*). Nevertheless, each local agency will need to modify its respective general plan and/or implementing ordinances to reflect the adopted ALUCP. At a minimum, the local agencies will be required to:

- Reference the new ALUCP by name and adoption date, or incorporate the compatibility criteria, policies, and zones into the appropriate plan; and
- Define the process that the local agency will follow when reviewing proposed land use development within the Airport Influence Area to ensure that the development will be consistent with the policies set forth in the ALUCP.

Once ALUC staff has determined, through administrative review, that the local agencies have fulfilled the above requirements and therefore deemed the applicable plans consistent with the adopted ALUCP, the local agencies will be able to review major land use actions pursuant to ALUCP section 1.4.2. Until then, they must refer major land use actions to the ALUC for review.

### ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Staff recommends that a Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental documentation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the County environmental guidelines. The proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature, and neither the project, the adoption of the ALUCP, nor its subsequent implementation by local agencies will lead to the development or any physical change to the existing land uses or the environment. Although the proposed ALUCP prohibits or restricts some specific incompatible land uses in certain locations, many types of new land use development will continue to be allowed in the vicinity of the Airport. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that there is no evidence that the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

Since the Notice of Completion was submitted to the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2015101104), the following noteworthy revisions were made to the ALUCP to address stakeholder concerns:

- The compatibility zones located north of the airport were changed from C1 and C2 to D.
  - Land Use/Planning: This section of the Initial Study analyzes consistency in terms of allowable density and intensity with the applicable general and specific plans. Since

- Compatibility Zone D is less restrictive than zones C1 and C2, the zone change will not create a conflict with the land use designations of the general and specific plans.
- Noise  
The southern portion of the former C-2 area is located within the 55 – 60 CNEL. Noise Policy 2.2.1 states that new residential development is incompatible within 60 (+) CNEL. This former C-2 area is located outside the 60 CNEL so the change in compatibility zones should not expose new residential units to unacceptable levels of noise.  
  
The area that was changed from zone C-1 to D is located within the Helicopter Overflight Envelope area as depicted in **Exhibit 5** and the Site-Specific Exception Area 1. Noise impacts will be mitigated by noise attenuation required by section 2.7.2(4).
  - Hazards/Hazardous Materials: The compatibility zone changes will allow greater (unlimited) intensity uses that would not otherwise be allowed under the C zones and uses without conditions (Additional Criteria) identified in Table 2A. Intensity limits are intended to reduce the number of people exposed to airport related safety hazards such as aircraft accidents. Under existing conditions and the current land use plan that governs this area, there are no intensity limits so the change from C zones to D is not anticipated to increase safety hazards to people.
- The following changes were made to Section 2.7.2 (Site-Specific Exception Area 1 - Old Town La Verne):
    - The maximum intensity limit was revised to apply to the entire Site Exception Area instead of just the project site.
    - The maximum occupancy limit for buildings was deleted.

Intensity and occupancy limits are intended to reduce the number of people exposed to airport related safety hazards such as aircraft accidents. The following policies that are included in the ALUCP should be sufficient to minimize the number of people exposed to airport related safety hazards in the Old Town La Verne Site Exception Area 1:

- New development shall be limited to a maximum intensity of 250 people per acre, averaged over Site 1. Except assembly spaces, the maximum intensity within any single acre, including all floors of a building, shall not exceed 1,000 people.
- New restaurants, theaters, conference rooms, and other assembly spaces shall be limited as follows:
  - Assembly spaces must be located on the ground floor of a building that is constructed of materials that would minimize the potential for an aircraft to intrude into the building in the event of an accident (concrete or steel walls with minimal windows facing south, west, or east; north-facing windows are acceptable in that they would be away from the normal direction of aircraft flight).
  - All assembly spaces (rooms having occupancy of 50 or more people) shall have direct emergency egress to the exterior of the building and the ground.

- Assembly spaces shall represent a combined total of no more than 10% of the total floor area of the building.
- Section 2.7.4 (Site-Specific Exception Area 6 - University of La Verne Campus West) was revised to acknowledge that the University of La Verne coordinates with the airport operator to ensure that compatibility between the airport and university is maintained during special events at the athletic center. This change does not affect the former C-2 analysis.

Based on the foregoing, the aforementioned ALUCP revisions will not result in increasing the exposure of people or property to noise or safety impacts related to the airport. Therefore, the revisions will not affect the Negative Declaration CEQA determination.

### LEGAL NOTIFICATION

In compliance with Section 65090 California Government Code, the ALUC public hearing was noticed for at least ten days in the local newspaper, San Gabriel Valley Tribune. Except for the aforementioned stakeholder comments, no comments regarding this project have been received from the public to date.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

#### Action

Staff recommends that the ALUC:

1. Adopt the Brackett Field ALUCP;
2. Find the local agencies' general and specific plans consistent with the ALUCP if the local agencies submit the following to the satisfaction of ALUC staff within 180 days of ALUCP adoption:
  - a. General Plan revised to reference the Brackett Field ALUCP by name and adoption date, or the appropriate plan revised to incorporate the ALUCP's compatibility criteria, policies, and zones; and
  - b. General Plan revised to define the process that the local agency will follow when reviewing proposed land use development within the Airport Influence Area to ensure that the development will be consistent with the policies set forth in the ALUCP.
3. Adopt the Negative Declaration pursuant to State and local CEQA requirements.

#### Motion

I move that the Airport Land Use Commission close the public hearing;

1. Find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and therefore adopt the Negative Declaration pursuant to State and local CEQA requirements;
2. Adopt the update to the Brackett Field ALUCP;
3. Find that the local agencies' general and specific plans will be consistent with the Brackett Field ALUCP if the local agencies submit the following to the satisfaction of ALUC staff within 180 days of ALUCP adoption:

General plan revised to reference the Brackett Field ALUCP by name and adoption date, or the appropriate plan revised to incorporate the ALUCP's compatibility criteria, policies, and zones;

And general plan revised to define the process that the local agency will follow when reviewing proposed land use development within the Airport Influence Area to ensure that the development will be consistent with the polices set forth in the ALUCP.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Draft Resolution
- B. Initial Study
- C. ALUCP

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**DRAFT RESOLUTION**



**AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN  
PROJECT NO. R2012-02527-(1,5)  
ADVANCE PLANNING CASE NO. 201200009; ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO.  
201500129**

**WHEREAS**, the Airport Land Use Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing in the matter of Advance Planning Case No. 201200009; Environmental Case No. 201500129 on December 9, 2015.

**WHEREAS**, the Airport Land Use Commission finds as follows:

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 (ALUC).
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 and thereby coordinating the airport planning of public agencies within the County.
3. Pursuant to Section 21670(a)(1) of the PUC the purpose of the State Aeronautics Act is to provide for the orderly development of each public use airport and the area surrounding these airports and to prevent the creation of new noise and safety problems.
4. Pursuant to Section 21674 of the PUC, the powers and duties of an ALUC include: assisting local agencies in ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of new and existing airports; coordinating planning at the state, regional and local levels so as to provide for the orderly development of air transportation; preparing and adopting Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans; and reviewing plans of local agencies to determine whether such plans are consistent with the applicable Airport Land use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).
5. Pursuant to Sections 21670(a)(2) and 21674(a), the ALUC has no authority over existing land uses regardless of whether such uses are incompatible with airport activities.
6. Pursuant to section 21675 of the Public Utilities Code (PUC), ALUCs are required to prepare and adopt an ALUCP that will provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission, and will safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general. The ALUCP shall include and shall be based on a long-range master plan or an airport layout plan, as determined by the Division of Aeronautics of the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which reflects the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next twenty (20) years. In preparing an airport land use compatibility plan, the commission may develop height restrictions on buildings, specify use of land, and determine building

standards, including soundproofing adjacent to airports, within the planning area.

7. Brackett Field Airport is located within the San Gabriel Valley of eastern Los Angeles County, 25 miles east of downtown Los Angeles. While the airport property lies predominantly within the City of La Verne, lands immediately beyond the eastern and western ends of the runways fall within the jurisdictions of the cities of Pomona and San Dimas, respectively. Other jurisdictions within the ALUCP project area are Claremont and Glendora. Small portions of Covina and Walnut lie along the outer edge of the project area.
8. Los Angeles County owns the airport property and major facilities. Overall responsibility for the airport rests with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Aviation Division.
9. The Brackett Field ALUCP sets forth policies, a planning boundary, intensity and density criteria for promoting compatibility between the airport and the surrounding land uses.
10. The ALUCP will serve as a tool for use by the ALUC to review plans, regulations or other planning actions within the airport influence area (AIA). Additionally, local agencies whose General Plan has been deemed consistent with the ALUCP by ALUC, will use their newly adopted General Plan to review land use projects located within their jurisdictions and the Airport Influence Area (AIA) for consistency with the policies of the ALUCP.
11. The ALUCP identifies three areas that warrant special treatment through area or site specific policies to local jurisdictions. These areas are Old Town La Verne, Los Angeles County Fairplex and University of La Verne Campus West.
12. The Old Town La Verne site is located near two commuter rail stations. The Old Town La Verne Specific Plan proposes redevelopment of this area from low-intensity nonresidential uses (mostly auto parking and mini-storage) to high-intensity, transit-oriented commercial, office, hotel, and residential uses. The site specific policies for this area are intended to remove any potential displacement that could result from the ALUCP. Displacement is defined as inadvertently shifting future development to less restrictive areas of the AIA or to other parts of the community where there are no ALUCP restrictions.
13. The Fairplex Association, a private company responsible for the operations of the Fairplex site, proposes redeveloping various portions of the Fairplex into more intensive uses potentially including: replacement of the horse racing track with a multi-use stadium; hotel and conference facilities; office space reusing existing horse barns; and, east of White Avenue, a shopping

- center. The site specific policies for this site are intended to allow proposed projects while minimizing airport related impacts.
14. The University of La Verne Master Plan allows housing for up to 5,000 graduate students, a business park, and/or single- or multi-family residential in the southern part of the site. The site specific policies for this area are intended to remove any potential displacement that could result from the ALUCP.
  15. On December 19, 1991 the Los Angeles County ALUC adopted the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), and subsequent amendment was made in 2004. For Brackett Field Airport, the ALUCP pre-empts the ALUP.
  16. As required by state law, the primary guidelines for preparation of compatibility plans are contained in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook) published by the Caltrans. The policies and maps in the ALUCP rely upon the guidance provided by the current October 2011, edition of the Handbook.
  17. In addition to the requirement that a compatibility plan be based upon the adopted airport master plan or airport layout plan, the Public Utilities Code states that a compatibility plan must reflect "the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next twenty (20) years." Because the Brackett Field Airport Master Plan has not been updated to reflect current and proposed airport operations, it is no longer relevant for compatibility planning purposes. Therefore, new forecasts were developed to take into account the above guidance and the historical activity at the airport. The resulting forecast used for the ALUCP assumes that Brackett Field could experience as much as 180,000 aircraft operations, though not more than this, within the 20-year planning time frame. This activity level is approximately double that of 2014, but more than 100,000 operations less than the 1990 historical high of nearly 290,000 operations.
  18. To provide input to the plan development, a working group was formed that included staff of the County Department of Public Works Aviation Division as the airport owner, the County Chief Executive Office as owner of the Los Angeles County Fairplex facility, the Fairplex Association as operator of the Fairplex facility, representatives of the planning departments of the affected cities, and staff of the Caltrans.
  19. Government Code Section 65302.3(a) requires that local jurisdiction's general and specific plans be consistent with the ALUCP. To be consistent a general or specific plan must avoid direct conflicts with compatibility planning criteria and specifically address compatibility planning issues, either directly or through reference to a zoning ordinance or other policy document.

20. The general and community plan policies for the County Los Angeles and the Cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona and San Dimas do conflict with the proposed ALUCP.
21. No conflicts between the ALUCP's compatibility criteria and local jurisdictions' land use designations are anticipated.
22. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65302.3, each local agency having jurisdiction over land uses within an ALUC's planning area, also referred to as the AIA, must modify its general plan and any affected specific plans to be consistent with the ALUCP. The law states that the local agency must take this action within 180 days of ALUCP adoption or amendment. Each local agency will need to modify its respective general plan and/or implementing ordinances to reflect the adopted ALUCP. At a minimum, the local agencies will be required to: reference this ALUCP by name and adoption date, or incorporate the compatibility criteria, policies, and zones into the appropriate plan; and define a process that the local agency will follow when reviewing proposed land use development within the Airport Influence Area to ensure that the development will be consistent with the policies set forth in the ALUCP. The aforementioned may be accomplished through administrative review by ALUC staff.
23. A Negative Declaration was prepared for the ALUCP and was determined to be the appropriate environmental documentation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the County environmental guidelines. The proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature, and neither the project, the adoption of the ALUCP, nor its subsequent implementation by local agencies will lead to the development or any physical change to the existing land uses or the environment. Although the proposed ALUCP prohibits or restricts some specific incompatible land uses in certain locations, many types of new land use development will continue to be allowed in the vicinity of the Airport. Therefore, the Initial Study concluded that there is no evidence that the project may have a significant impact on the environment.
24. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. The stakeholders requested changes to the compatibility zone boundaries and to the policies of the Site-Specific Exception policies. The requested changes were made to the ALUCP
25. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is at the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the

Community Studies East Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

**RESOLVED**, that the Airport Land Use Commission adopts:

1. The Negative Declaration, dated October 27, 2015, certifies its completion and determine that the project will not have a significant impact upon the environment;
2. The Brackett Field ALUCP.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Airport Land Use Commission on the County of Los Angeles on December 9, 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rosie Ruiz, Secretary  
County of Los Angeles  
Airport Land Use Commission

**VOTE:**

Concurring:

Dissenting:

Abstaining:

Absent:

Action Date: December 9, 2015

CS:de



**ATTACHMENT B**  
**INITIAL STUDY**



**Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)**  
**County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning**



**Project title:** Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) / Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning Project No. R2012-02527-(1,5); Advance Planning Case No. 201200009; Environmental Case No. 201500129

**Lead agency name and address:** Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Contact Person and phone number:** Dean Edwards: 213-974-6425

**Project sponsor's name and address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project location:** Centered on 1615 McKinley Ave, La Verne, CA 91750 and extending out approximately 14,000 feet in all directions

**APN:** \_\_\_\_\_ **USGS Quad:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Gross Acreage:** Approximately 27 square miles

**General plan designation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Community/Area wide Plan designation:** The following plans exist within the study area:

City of Claremont – General Plan

City of Covina – General Plan

City of Glendora – Community Plan

City of La Verne – General Plan

Old Town La Verne Specific Plan

Arrow Corridor Specific Plan

City of Pomona – General Plan

Pomona Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan

Pomona Valley Medical Center Specific Plan

Pomona Corridors Specific Plan

City of San Dimas – General Plan

County of Los Angeles – General Plan

Fairplex – Transit-Oriented Development

University of La Verne Master Plan/Update

Brackett Field Airport Master Plan

Brackett Field Airport Layout Plan

**Zoning:** (In addition to the zoning designation, indicate which Community Standards District the property is located within, if applicable.) The project area encompasses portions of the following jurisdictions: Unincorporated Los Angeles County, and the cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona, and San Dimas. Zoning designations are similar to the list of planned land uses listed above under “General plan designation”.

**Description of project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)

The proposed Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) provides land use compatibility policies and criteria for the area surrounding Brackett Field, and consists of several components, including the provision of airport information, compatibility policies and criteria, compatibility zone maps, procedural policies and land use information. The basic function of the ALUCP is to promote compatibility between Brackett Field and the land uses that surround the Airport and, as such, the proposed ALUCP includes specified limitations and conditions on the future development of new residential, commercial and other noise and risk sensitive uses surrounding the Airport. The proposed ALUCP addresses land use on the Brackett Field Airport site and the area surrounding the Airport. Brackett Field is located in the eastern portion of Los Angeles County, approximately 30 miles east of downtown Los Angeles.

The creation of airport land use commissions and airport land use compatibility plans are requirements of the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21670 et seq.). The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles acting in its capacity as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), is proposing to adopt an airport land use compatibility plan (ALUCP) for Brackett Field Airport (Airport), which will replace an earlier plan last revised in 2004. Preparation of the ALUCP was guided by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics' California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (2011), as required by Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a).

The policies of the proposed ALUCP apply only to future land use development in the airport environs. The ALUCP is only a tool for the ALUC to review development proposed by others, and does not propose any development itself. Neither the ALUCP nor the ALUC have any authority over existing land uses. Also, neither the ALUCP nor the ALUC has authority over the manner in which the Airport is developed or operated. Development of the Airport continues to be under the control of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (County) with input from a ten-member Aviation Commission.

Compatibility criteria in the proposed ALUCP address four types of compatibility concerns: noise, as identified by cumulative aircraft noise exposure contours; overflight, which addresses the annoyance generated by aircraft operations in areas beyond the noise contours; safety, which is concerned with minimizing the potential consequences of an aircraft accident near the Airport should one occur; and airspace protection, which sets limits on the height of objects and restricts certain other activities that could potentially cause or exacerbate an accident. To satisfy the criteria, certain types of future land uses in the Airport Influence Area (AIA) would be prohibited, restricted in terms of density, intensity and height, or required to meet other conditions designed to make the use acceptable. The Airport's AIA encompasses portions of the following jurisdictions: Unincorporated Los Angeles County, and the cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona, and San Dimas.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** Most of the Airport's surroundings are heavily urbanized. The major exceptions are to the southwest and south where Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park, Puddingstone Reservoir, and Mountain Meadows Golf Course are located. Also, to the east is the Los Angeles County Fairplex which includes large areas of paved parking lots. During the annual fair and other major events, the entire fairgrounds are intensively occupied. The most intensive permanent development nearby is in the downtowns and old towns of San Dimas to the northwest and La Verne to the northeast of the airport. Very few large properties having development potential remain in the airport environs. Most future development is expected to consist of either small infill projects or redevelopment. Both San Dimas and La

Verne plan greater intensities in their central areas. Particularly noteworthy because of its proximity to the airport is the high-intensity, transit-oriented development planned for southeastern La Verne around the Gold Line and Metrolink rail stations. A combination of residential and commercial uses with high-rise structures is planned. This development would directly connect with a promenade and other new or expanded facilities contemplated for the Fairplex immediately to the south of the rail stations.

University of La Verne adopted their Facilities and Technology Master Plan in January 2015, which includes planning for Campus West. The area affected by the proposed ALUCP (approximately 30 acres) in Zone C2 proposed an athletic complex that is under construction on the northern portion of the site. Contemplated uses for the southern part of the site had included housing for up to 5,000 graduate students, business park, and/or single- or multi-family residential, but no specific proposal has been approved by the City.

### **Summary of Potential Environmental Effects:**

The proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature, and neither the project—the adoption of the ALUCP—nor its subsequent implementation by local agencies will lead to the development or any physical change to the existing land uses or the environment. Although the proposed ALUCP prohibits or restricts some specific incompatible land uses in certain locations, many types of new land use development will continue to be allowed in the vicinity of the Airport.

As described above, the general plan policies for the County Los Angeles and the Cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona and San Dimas generally do not directly conflict with the proposed ALUCP, however some areas of potential conflict do exist with the adopted Old Town La Verne Specific Plan, University of La Verne Master Plan (Campus West), and Fairplex development plan. Those jurisdictions may be required to make minor changes to their plans to be fully consistent with the ALUCP or to take action to overrule the ALUC.

In terms of the jurisdictions' general plan land use diagrams, (Exhibit 5) identifies where conflicts exist between the planned land uses shown on the land use diagrams and the proposed ALUCP criteria. For the County, and cities of Claremont, Glendora, Pomona and San Dimas, the planned land uses are consistent with the proposed compatibility criteria.

The proposed ALUCP may indirectly influence future land use development patterns in the vicinity of Brackett Field by enabling development in some locations and constraining development in other locations. Any future development would be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), ensuring that potential impacts are studied, disclosed and mitigated where feasible.

As described in Section 11 – Land Use and Planning, although the proposed ALUCP establishes criteria that would either prohibit or restrict certain types of land uses within the Airport Influence Area, the land uses that either exist or planned within the Airport Influence Area are generally consistent with the proposed compatibility criteria with the few exceptions noted above.

As described in Section 14 – Population and Housing, the Old Town La Verne Old Town Specific Plan (OTLVSP), and Fairplex Plan propose development within Zones B1 and C1 close to the east ends of the runways. Even though special site-specific exceptions are being proposed for OTLVSP and Fairplex, the development in these locations will potentially be constrained to less than the maximum currently specified.

Regarding existing residential development within the project area: because neither this proposed ALUCP nor the ALUC have authority over existing land uses, existing residential development can continue to be shown on General Plan and Specific Plan maps without it being considered a conflict.

As described in Section 15, adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would create a temporary increase in the staff workloads of affected land use jurisdictions as a result of the state requirement to modify local general plans for consistency with the ALUCP. However, this effect would be temporary. Over the long term, the procedural policies included in the ALUCP are intended to simplify and clarify the ALUC project review process and reduce workload for ALUC and planning staff members.

No environmental categories would be affected by this project to the extent of having a “Potentially Significant Impact.” Two impact categories, “Land Use/Land Use Planning” and “Population/Housing” were identified as having a “Less than Significant Impact.” Appropriate discussions are provided for impact categories that warrant some explanation.

**Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
----------------------	--------------------------

_____	_____
_____	_____

**Major projects in the area:**

<i>Project/Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
-------------------------	-------------------------------

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

**Reviewing Agencies:** [See CEQA Appendix B to help determine which agencies should review your project]

*Responsible Agencies*

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - Los Angeles Region
  - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers

*Special Reviewing Agencies*

- County of Los Angeles
- City of Pomona
- City of San Dimas
- City of La Verne
- City of Glendora
- City of Claremont
- State of California, Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics

*Regional Significance*

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- 

*Trustee Agencies*

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

*County Reviewing Agencies*

- DPW:
  - (delete those that don't apply)
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Traffic and Lighting Division
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
  - Sewer Maintenance Division

- Fire Department
  - (delete those that don't apply)
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
  - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
- 

2/1/00  
 21-1020

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest   | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials  | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality      | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources            | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy               | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils        |   |   |


DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Prepared by)

10/27/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Approved by)

10-27-15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

## 1. AESTHETICS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a - d) The proposed Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to aesthetics. The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of aesthetic resources, both known and unknown. Because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to the environment that would directly or indirectly result in any impacts to aesthetic resources. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

**Mitigation Required: None.**

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None**

**2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a - e) See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). The Airport Influence Area includes some areas designated for agricultural uses. The proposed ALUCP is regulatory; it does not provide for any physical change to the environment that would conflict with agricultural use within the AIA or result in its conversion to other uses.

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None



### 3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a – e) The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to air quality. The proposed ALUCP would not result in increased air emissions or a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant, violate any air quality standards, conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans, expose sensitive receptors to substantial

pollutant concentrations, nor create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and, as such, would not give rise to any direct impacts to air quality. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

**Mitigation: None required.**

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None**

#### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36),	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a - g) No Impact. The State Department of Fish and Wildlife created the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), which is a program that inventories the status and locations of rare plants and animals in California. The Brackett Field Airport is in the vicinity of a CNDDDB designated zone for an animal habitat within 80 meters. The habitat area is designated as a circular radius zone from an area where that specific animal has been known to inhabit. The Brackett Field Airport has been in operation since the 1930's and the area surrounding has been built out for many decades. The ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment.

The proposed ALUCP also would not increase levels of development in any area within the airport influence area (AIA) above those projected for these areas in local planning documents (e.g., general plans), the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in certified environmental documentation. Indeed, the County and other surrounding cities have adopted policies and/or mitigation measures intended to protect certain biological resources in their jurisdictions. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to biological resources. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

a - d) The airport influence area (AIA) has the potential to contain a wide variety of cultural resources, both known and unknown. Known cultural resources within the AIA could include historic buildings, bridges, or districts; while unknown cultural resources could include undiscovered paleontological resources or human remains.

The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, nor would it destroy or disturb a unique paleontological resource or specified human remains and, as such, would not give rise to any direct impacts to cultural resources. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

**Mitigation: None required.**

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None**

**6. ENERGY**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a - b) The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to energy. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

**Mitigation:** None required.

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures:** None

## 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</b>				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Conservation and Open Space Element?

### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a – f) The proposed Airport Influence Area is in a Liquefaction Zone according to Seismic Hazard Map that is created by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. However, because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to existing land uses or the environment that would directly or indirectly result in any significant impacts to geology, soils or seismicity. The proposed ALUCP also would not increase levels of development in any area within the AIA above those projected for these areas in local planning documents (e.g., general plans), the environmental effects of which were already adequately analyzed in certified environmental documentation. Indeed, the County and other surrounding cities have adopted policies and/or mitigation measures intended to protect against hazards associated with geology, soils, and seismicity in their jurisdictions. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable /Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

## 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a, b) The proposed ALUCP regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to existing land uses or the environment that would directly or indirectly result in any impacts to greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to GHG emissions. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

## 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the				

project is located:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a-d, f-h)The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to hazards and hazardous materials. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

e) The proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any development or physical change to existing land uses or the environment. Pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act, the purpose of the proposed ALUCP is to minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within the airport vicinity. Therefore, adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of the Airport.

The proposed ALUCP uses the aircraft accident risk data and safety compatibility concepts provided in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Caltrans, 2011) to establish compatibility safety zones (i.e., areas exposed to significant safety hazards). The proposed ALUCP establishes safety criteria and policies that limit concentrations of people within the safety zones. The purpose of the policies is to minimize the risks and potential consequences associated with an off-airport aircraft accident or emergency landing. The policies consider the risks both to people and property in the vicinity of the Airport and to people on board the aircraft.

The risks of an aircraft accident occurrence is further reduced by airspace protection policies that limit the height of structures, trees, and other objects that might penetrate the Airport’s airspace as defined by Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Part 77, “Safe, Efficient Use, and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace.” The airspace protection policies also restrict land use features that may generate other hazards to flight such as visual hazards (i.e., smoke, dust, steam, etc.), electronic hazards that may disrupt aircraft

communications or navigation, and wildlife hazards (i.e., uses which would attract wildlife hazardous to aircraft operations). Therefore, no impact is anticipated as a result of the adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP.

**Mitigation: None required.**

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None**

## 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<hr/>				
f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?

i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

l) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?

m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

n) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a-m, o) The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to hydrology and water quality. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

n) The proposed ALUCP area is in the Potential Dam Inundation Areas in Los Angeles County. This is an area that might be flooded in the event of a catastrophic failure of a dam. These maps showing hypothetical potential dam inundation areas were created to comply with Section 8589.5 of the California Government Code which requires that the owners of certain dams designated by the Office of Emergency Services prepare and file with said office maps delineating the areas of potential flooding. The flow would not necessarily cover the entire area within the designated boundary.

Brackett Field Airport is located in the outer edge of a potential dam inundation area. However, this proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would no impact to potential dam inundation. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

## 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) <b>Physically divide an established community?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <b>Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <b>Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <b>Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a, c, d) See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of environmental resources, both known and unknown. Because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to existing land uses or the environment that would directly or indirectly result in a substantial adverse effect on the environment or human beings or substantially degrade the environment.

b) State law (Government Code Section 65302.3) requires each local agency having jurisdiction over land uses within an ALUC's planning area, also referred to as the Airport Influence Area (AIA), to modify its general plan and any affected specific plans to be consistent with the ALUCP. The law says that the local agency must take this action within 180 days of ALUCP adoption or amendment. The only other course of action available to local agencies is to overrule the ALUC by, among other things, a two-thirds vote of its governing body after making findings that the agency's plans are consistent with the intent of state airport land use planning statutes (Public Utilities Code Section 21676(b)). A general plan does not need to be identical with an ALUCP in order to be consistent with it. To meet the consistency test, a general plan must do two things:

1. It must specifically address compatibility planning issues, either directly or through reference to a zoning ordinance or other policy document; and

2. It must avoid direct conflicts with compatibility planning criteria.

With regard to the proposed ALUCP, the County Los Angeles and the Cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona and San Dimas are the six general purpose government entities having land use jurisdiction in the proposed AIA. As such, once the ALUCP is adopted by the ALUC, these agencies will be required to amend their general plans and/or implementing ordinances (if inconsistencies exist) to be consistent with the ALUCP or to take action to overrule the ALUC.

Areas of potential concern:

Raging Waters: This existing high-intensity recreational facility is situated a mile west of the runways and close to the straight-out and straight-in flight paths. Although this is an existing land use, any plans to modify or expand the facilities would be subject to policies in the ALUCP. As indicated in the earlier discussion of composite compatibility zone delineation, noise is more of a consideration in the general area than safety. Raging Waters is not a noise-sensitive use, so no conflicts result in that regard. With respect to safety-related usage intensity limits, consideration might be given to setting a high limit that would not conflict with the current use, but would limit expansion. Otherwise, a "no limit" criterion could be applied as indicated in the earlier criteria table.

University of La Verne Campus West: The University controls property adjacent to the north side of the airport and near the middle of the runways. The mostly completed athletic complex is deemed an existing use for the purposes of the proposed ALUCP. Spectator stands having a capacity of up to 299 people are acceptable with each field. Any field lighting shall be shielded to minimize glare to pilots and air traffic controllers to the satisfaction of airport management. Currently, the area is mostly affected by the helicopter flight training pattern, although there are also noise impacts and low to moderate safety concerns from airplanes on the adjacent runways. The development is relatively low intensity use for students and would likely not conflict with airport compatibility criteria.

Fairplex Drag Strip: Portions of the existing spectator stands lie within the RPZ for Runway 26R which is a conflict with FAA standards that serve as the basis for the ALUCP Zone A criteria. Actions to remedy this situation are up to the FAA, the County as the airport's owner, and the Fairplex and do not necessarily involve the ALUC. However, any future expansion of the drag strip facilities (additional spectator stands, new structures, or other features for which county or city discretionary approval is required) should be subject to ALUC review.

Other Fairplex Development Plans: Much of the Fairplex property lies within the Brackett Field runway approaches and the ALUCP compatibility zones for which noise and safety compatibility criteria will apply. While airport-generated noise is not an issue for the Fairplex uses, safety concerns are. The Fairplex is different from most land uses, however, in that the intensity of its use varies greatly from week to week. The most intensively used sites are the drag racing spectator stands along the northwest edge and the horse racing stands and various exhibition buildings in the southeastern corner of the property. According to Fairplex officials, as many as 150,000 people may occupy the property during the fair. Other events throughout the year also attract large crowds. However, on over half the days of the year, usage is minimal. Fairplex officials contemplate redeveloping various

portions of the grounds into more intensive uses potentially including: replacement of the horse racing track with a multi-use stadium; hotel and conference facilities; office space reusing existing horse barns; and, east of White Avenue, a shopping center. Special site-specific policies for the Fairplex have been created to address the complexity of land uses for this area. The emphasis of such policies are focused on restricting new development within the RPZs and other highly aviation-risk sensitive locations, while allowing further development in other areas.

La Verne Transit-Oriented Development Site: In March 2013, the City of La Verne adopted a specific plan for the area in the southeastern portion of the city known as Old Town La Verne. The southern edge of the area encompasses approximately 18.8 acres (excluding rail right-of-way), 14.6 acres of which are within the north end of the Los Angeles County Fairplex. The site is adjacent to two commuter rail stations. The specific plan proposes redevelopment of this area from low-intensity nonresidential uses (mostly auto parking and mini-storage) to high-intensity, transit-oriented commercial, office, hotel, and residential uses. Beyond adoption of the specific plan, the city has taken no actions to entitle the development to proceed. Compatibility between the development and airport activity also needs to be considered, however. With airport activity currently low compared to historical levels, the site is not greatly impacted. The ALUCP, though, must anticipate the impacts of a higher airport traffic volume and increased use of the north runway. The ALUCP Compatibility Zone C1 that stops at Arrow Highway, covers about half of the redevelopment site. Usage intensity limits have been established for this area, although special policies setting the limits higher than elsewhere in Zone C1 have been considered. The heights of structures relative to airspace protection surfaces have also been considered.

The general plan consistency review detailed below focuses on two types of inconsistencies:

1. Adopted general plan policies pertaining to airport land use compatibility planning that either directly conflict or need to be amended to reflect changes in the proposed ALUCP policies and maps; and

2. Land use designations provided in the adopted general plan land use map that may conflict with the ALUCP criteria.

### **General Plan Policies**

No direct conflicts exist between the proposed ALUCP policies and the general plan policies adopted by the local agencies addressing airport land use compatibility matters (see Exhibit 1 below). Nevertheless, each local agency will need to modify its respective general plan and/or implementing ordinances to reflect the new ALUCP for Brackett Field following its adoption by the ALUC. At a minimum, the local agencies will be required to:

1. Reference the new ALUCP by name and adoption date;

2. Describe the process that the local agency will follow when forwarding certain land use actions to the ALUC for review;

3. Define the process that the local agency will follow when reviewing proposed land use development within the Airport Influence Area to ensure that the development will be consistent with the polices set forth in the ALUCP; and

4. Incorporate the compatibility criteria, policies, and zones.

Amending the local general plans for consistency with the new ALUCP is deemed to be a minor administrative effort and is, therefore, considered to be a less-than significant impact.

<b>Exhibit 1: Established Airport Compatibility Measures</b>
<b>County of Los Angeles</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Los Angeles County General Plan (1980)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ No airport compatibility policies</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <i>Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (March 2015 Public Draft)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Policy LU 6.5: “Ensure airport operation compatibility with adjacent land uses through airport land use plans.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>City of Claremont</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>City of Claremont General Plan (2006)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Noise element notes that “Although Brackett Field’s noise contours do not impact Claremont, flight paths cross over the City and Claremont residents occasionally voice concerns over associated noise.”</li> <li>▫ Noise Policy 6-11.7: “Encourage the operators of Cable Airport (City of Upland) and Brackett Field (City of La Verne and the County of Los Angeles) to ensure that the users of the airports know and obey flight-pattern requirements and altitude restrictions.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>City of Glendora</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Glendora Community Plan 2025</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ No reference to Brackett Field or airport compatibility</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>City of La Verne</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>La Verne General Plan (1998)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ Land Use Policy 11.5a: “Require commercial, office, industrial, private or county development to adhere to the <i>Brackett Field Master Plan</i> and be consistent with the settlement agreement between the City of La Verne and Los Angeles County.”</li> <li>▫ Land Use Policy 11.5b: “Require that all privately controlled airport operations or any airport operations not required by the FAA obtain City approval.”</li> <li>▫ Land Use Policy 11.5f: “Support retention and preservation of the existing natural open space in Bonelli Park and demand compliance with our general plan.”</li> <li>▫ Transportation Policy 9.1i: “Support the Airport Land Use Commission’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Brackett Field Airport, which includes policies that: Restrict incompatible</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

development in their vicinity; Protect designated open space in high-risk zones; Restrict structure height in the vicinity of the airport; Recommend buyer awareness programs for surrounding properties; Require sound insulation measures for adjacent development.”

- Noise Policy 5.1: Maintain noise from Brackett Field at its current level.
- Community Facilities Policy 7.1a: “Support development of hotel and commercial uses within the Brackett Field Master Plan.”
- *Old Town La Verne Specific Plan (March 2013)*
  - Envisions transit-oriented development adjacent to rail lines at north side of Fairplex
  - No reference to airport compatibility
- *Arrow Corridor Specific Plan (2006)*
  - “The Plan maintains the development patterns of Brackett Field and is consistent with the Brackett Field Master Plan, which allows airport-related and light industrial uses in certain portions of Brackett Field.”
  - “Brackett Airport administrators shall review proposals within the Airport Runway Protection Zone [not mapped], a corridor affected by operations at Brackett Field. Due consideration shall be given to avoid glare and reflection that could interfere with pilots’ ability to see as they approach or leave Brackett Field.”

#### City of Pomona

- *Pomona General Plan (March 2011 Public Review Draft)*
  - Mentions that CNEL 60 dB contour extends into Fairplex
  - No airport compatibility policies
- *Pomona Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (November 2012)*
  - Does not address airport compatibility
- *Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center Specific Plan (January 2010)*
  - Does not address airport compatibility
- *Pomona Corridors Specific Plan (June 2013)*
  - Does not address airport compatibility
- *Pomona “F” Zone Ordinance*
  - Establishes list of uses permitted outright and ones permitted with a conditional use permit
  - No reference to Brackett Field

#### City of San Dimas

- *San Dimas General Plan (1991)*
  - Noise Element Policy 3.1.3: “The City will monitor the existing operations of Brackett Airport and any plans for future developments. Any actions that increase the level of noise throughout the City will be discouraged. These include flight operations, and flight paths that pass over the City.”

### **General Plan Map**

In order to attain general plan consistency with the proposed ALUCP, no direct conflicts should exist between planned land uses shown on a local jurisdiction's general plan land use map and the proposed ALUCP criteria. The criteria listed in Table 2A, *Basic Compatibility Criteria*, together with the compatibility zones depicted on Map 2A, *Compatibility Zones*, of the proposed ALUCP are the primary policy instruments to be used in determining whether a general plan land use designation is consistent with the proposed ALUCP. See Exhibits 2 and 3 for a copy of ALUCP Table 2A and Map 2A. Both the table and map take into account all four compatibility concerns: noise, safety, airspace protection and overflight. There are seven compatibility zones proposed for Brackett Field:

- Zone A – Runway Protection Zone
- Zone B1 – Inner Approach/Departure Zone
- Zone B2 – Adjacent to Runway Zone
- Zone C1 – Turning and Extended Approach Zone
- Zone C2 – Extended Departure Zone and Helicopter Flight Training Zone
- Zone D – Primary Traffic Pattern Zone
- Zone E – Other Airport Environs

To identify potential conflicts with the proposed ALUCP, the proposed compatibility zones were overlaid onto the planned land use designations reflected in the adopted general plan maps (see Exhibit 4 for a copy of ALUCP Exhibit 10A, *General Plan Land Uses*). The compatibility zones which could potentially prohibit or restrict future residential densities (dwelling units per acre) or non-residential usage intensities (people per acre) were compared to the allowable densities and intensities provided in the local general plans. A conflict would exist if the general plan densities allow more residential units than would be permitted under the ALUCP. These types of land use conflicts can indirectly change future land use development patterns by shifting or “displacing” future development to less restrictive areas of the Airport Influence Area or to other parts of the community where there are no ALUCP restrictions.

Displacement involves changes to the patterns of land use development that has not yet occurred. The ALUCP has no effect on existing land uses and no displacement of existing development will occur as a result of adoption of the proposed ALUCP. The task of measuring displacement includes calculating how much new development can be built in the Airport Influence Area in accordance with the provisions of the applicable county or city general plan, then compare that amount with how much development would be allowed under the restrictions of the proposed ALUCP and the difference is the displacement.

The need to analyze “displacement” as part of the environmental impact analysis for adoption of an ALUCP stems from a 2007 California State Supreme Court Case, *Mussy Ranch Co. v. Solano County Airport Land Use Commission*. Among other things, in its decision in that case the court found that “...placing a ban on development in one area of a jurisdiction may have the consequence, notwithstanding existing zoning or land use planning, of displacing development to other areas of the jurisdiction.” While an ALUCP does not and need not determine where the displaced development would move to—and, indeed, ALUCs have no authority by which to make such a decision—the extent of the conflict that results in the displacement must be analyzed.

Below is a summary of the consistency findings for each of the six general purpose government entities having land use jurisdiction in the proposed Airport Influence Area. Note that for the purposes of this consistency analysis, the general plan land use designations covering either the airport property or lands within Compatibility Zones D and E are excluded from the evaluation for the following reasons:

1. The ALUC has no authority over the operation of Brackett Field, including the types of aviation-related facilities to be provided on the airport. Although the ALUC's jurisdiction extends to reviewing proposed nonaviation development of airport property, the current (2010) FAA-approved Airport Layout Plan indicates that only aviation-related development is proposed at Brackett Airport. Therefore, no conflicts are anticipated for the airport property.
2. The proposed ALUCP does not set limits on residential densities (dwelling units per acre) or usage intensities (number of people per acre) for nonresidential development in Zones D and E. Rather, the proposed ALUCP criteria recommends avoiding land use features that would create an airspace hazard (e.g., tall objects, bird attractants) and limiting bulk storage of hazardous materials on site. The proposed ALUCP does, however, prohibit new sites or expansion of existing children's schools within Zone D. A review of local general plans indicates that no schools exist or are proposed within Zones A through D. Therefore, no conflicts are anticipated within Zones D and E.

### Los Angeles County

Several pockets of unincorporated land of Los Angeles County exists within the proposed Airport Influence Area, in Compatibility Zone E. No conflicts are anticipated.

### Claremont

Portions of the City of Claremont fall within the northeastern portion of the proposed Airport Influence Area, in Compatibility Zone E. No conflicts are anticipated.

### Glendora

Portions of the City of Glendora fall within the northwestern limits of the proposed Airport Influence Area, in Compatibility Zone E. No conflicts are anticipated.

### La Verne

Brackett Field is owned and operated by the County of Los Angeles. The airport lies within the limits of the City of La Verne. Several compatibility zones affect lands off-airport within the City of La Verne. These areas have general plan designations of Industrial, Commercial and Residential and are covered by several specific plans. Exhibit 5 identifies the specific plan designation affected by one or more compatibility

zones. The exhibit also provides a consistency determination of whether the specific plan designation is consistent with the proposed ALUCP land use criteria. A determination of consistency means that no land use displacement would result with the adoption of the proposed ALUCP. The proposed ALUCP establishes special conditions for certain known specific plan projects enabling them to be exempt from the basic compatibility criteria provided in the proposed ALUCP. The special exception is intended to remove any potential displacement that would result under the basic criteria of the proposed ALUCP.

<b>Exhibit 5</b>		
<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>ALUCP Zone</b>	<b>Consistency Determination</b>
Arrow Corridor Specific Plan		
Business Park (BP)	B2, C1, C2	The proposed ALUCP allows a mix of commercial and office uses within Zones B2, C1 and C2, provided that the intensity criteria are met. Within Zone C2, no conflict is anticipated as the uses permitted under the Specific Plan would be allowed under the proposed ALUCP. Additionally, no conflict is anticipated for the area within Zones B2 and C1 as this area is built out. No specific redevelopment proposals are anticipated for these areas. Therefore, no conflict is anticipated as the proposed ALUCP does not apply to existing uses.
Commercial / Manufacturing (CM)	B1, C1, C2	The CM designation allows a broad range of retail-service commercial and light industrial land uses, which are generally consistent with the ALUCP criteria for Zones B1, C1 and C2, provided that the intensity criteria are met. Within Zone C2, no conflict is anticipated as the uses permitted under the Specific Plan would be allowed under the proposed ALUCP. However, within Zones B1 and C1, a restaurant or other high-intensity use, for example, would be required to satisfy the ALUCP intensity limits. Currently, the 15-acre area within Zones B1 and C1 includes a residential neighborhood, a mini storage facility and a light industrial use. No specific redevelopment proposals are anticipated for this area. Therefore, no conflict is anticipated as the proposed ALUCP does not apply to existing uses.
Industrial	C2	Within Zone C2, no conflict is anticipated as the industrial uses permitted under the Specific Plan would be allowed under the

		proposed ALUCP.
<b>Old Town La Verne Specific Plan</b>		
Transit-Oriented Development	B1, C1	The affected area (approximately 19 acres) within Zone C1, and a small portion (< 1.0 acre) within Zone B1, is covered by a proposed ALUCP site-specific exception (see ALUCP Policy 2.7.2, Site 1). The Specific Plan proposes redevelopment of this area from low-intensity nonresidential uses (mostly auto parking and mini-storage) to high-intensity, transit-oriented commercial, office, hotel, and residential uses of up to 70 dwelling units per acre. The special exception is intended to remove any potential displacement that would result under the basic criteria of the proposed ALUCP. Therefore, no conflict is anticipated.
<b>SP81-2 (Walnut)</b>		
Residential (6 du/acre)	C2	The residential density of 6 du/acre is consistent with the proposed ALUCP criterion for Zone C2 of 15 du/acre. Therefore, no conflict is anticipated.
<b>University of La Verne Master Plan</b>		
West Campus	C2	The affected area (approximately 30 acres) in Zone C2 is covered by a proposed ALUCP site-specific exception (see ALUCP Policy 2.7.4, Site 6). An athletic complex is under construction on the northern portion of the site. Contemplated uses for the southern part of the site had included housing for up to 5,000 graduate students, business park, and/or single- or multi-family residential, but no specific proposal has been approved by the City. The special exception acknowledges the athletic complex as an existing use and conditionally allows student housing and other contemplated uses for the site. The special exception is intended to remove any potential displacement that would result under the basic compatibility criteria of the proposed ALUCP. Therefore, no conflict is anticipated.

The City of Pomona is located west of Brackett Field. The majority of the area affected by the compatibility zones is the Los Angeles County Fairplex property. The majority of the property is owned by the County of Los Angeles but leased to Fairplex, a private organization. The Fairplex is interested in redeveloping portions of the property into more intensive uses potentially including: replacement of the horse racing track with a multi-use stadium, hotel and conference facilities; office space reusing existing horse barns; and east of White Avenue, a shopping center. However, no formal redevelopment plans have been approved for the site. The proposed site-specific exception (see ALUCP Policy 2.7.3, Sites 2, 3, 4 and 5) is intended to remove any potential displacement in the redevelopment areas that would result under the basic compatibility criteria of the proposed ALUCP. The portions not covered by the site-specific exception are subject to the basic density and intensity limits of the proposed ALUCP. Exhibit 6 below provides a consistency determination for these affected areas.

<b>Exhibit 6</b>		
<b>General Plan Designation</b>	<b>ALUCP Zone</b>	<b>Consistency Determination</b>
Open Space	B2	The affected area includes a small portion of the back greens of the Mountain Meadows Golf Course. As an existing use that is not subject to the proposed ALUCP criteria, no conflict is anticipated.
Institutional  (Zoning District F, Fairgrounds)	A, B1, C1	This designation covers the Fairplex property. The City of Pomona's zoning ordinance, District F, permits fair-related uses outright (e.g., child care, drag racing, horse racing, exhibitions, conferences, and food service) and conditionally permits non-fair-related uses (e.g., convention centers, hotels, large commercial/retail developments and residential developments). District F also allows many fair-related uses (e.g., performing arts theaters, drag racing facilities, exhibition buildings, and grandstands) to be "maintained, altered, expanded or erected . . . without any permits except for building and grading permits as applicable." Although some of these uses are highly intensive and inconsistent with the criteria in the proposed ALUCP, they are uses that already exist on the fairgrounds and their continuation is not subject to the proposed ALUCP. Alteration also would be allowed to the extent that the uses are not expanded in a manner that would increase the incompatibility.

		Expansion of the uses would be subject to the policies of the proposed ALUCP. Some expansion would potentially be consistent with the compatibility criteria and other expansion or redevelopment is specifically covered by site-specific exceptions (see Policy 2.7.3, Sites 2, 3, 4 and 5) provided in the proposed ALUCP. Based upon information provided by Fairplex management, the site-specific exceptions address the redevelopment that is contemplated and the portion of the Fairplex not covered by the site-specific exception are intended to be used as they are today (e.g., parking lots, drag racing stands and other fair-related uses). No conflict is thus anticipated.
Single-Family Residential	B1, C1	The affected area includes existing residential neighborhoods at densities of 5 to 7 dwelling units per acre. Although the proposed ALUCP prohibits new single-family residences in Zones B1 and C1, the affected area is built out. Therefore, no displacement is anticipated.

**San Dimas**

The City of San Dimas is located west of Brackett Field. The portion of the City located near the Puddingstone Reservoir is affected by the proposed ALUCP. Exhibit 7 below identifies the planned land use designations affected by the proposed compatibility zones. A consistency determination is provided for each land use designation.

<b>Exhibit 7</b>		
<b>General Plan Designation</b>	<b>ALUCP Zone</b>	<b>Consistency Determination</b>
Open Space Park – RP	A, B1, C1, C2	The affected area includes an existing RV park, regional park, Raging Waters and Puddingstone Reservoir/ recreation area. Although expansion of existing or the addition of new recreational facilities would be subject to the proposed ALUCP intensity limits, no conflict is anticipated as many of the recreational uses permitted under the general plan are consistent with the uses allowed under the

		proposed ALUCP.
Single-Family Very Low, SP-8 (0.2-3 du/ac)	B1, C1, C2	Current zoning allows residential densities of 0.2-3 du/acre. The proposed ALUCP limits residential densities in Zones B1 and C1 to one single-family home on a legal lot of record, zoned for residential use at the time of ALUCP adoption (see ALUCP Policy 1.5.3). Therefore, the general plan density conflicts with the proposed ALUCP density criteria for Zones B1 and C1. No conflict exists within Zone C2 as the proposed ALUCP allows a density of up to 15 du/acre. See <b>Exhibit 8</b> for displacement calculations for Zones B1 and C1.
Single-Family, SF-10,000	C1, C2	Current zoning requires a minimum residential lot size of 10,000 square feet (approximately 0.25 acres). This designation is consistent with the proposed ALUCP density limit of 15 du/acre in Zone C2. In Zone C1, the majority of the properties are 0.5 acres or more. The entire area in Zone C1 is built out and the home are situated on the lot in a manner that would preclude a lot split. As such, no conflict is anticipated.
Single-Family Hillside, Very Low Estate, (1.5-3 acre min. lot size)	C1	Small portions of three parcels fall within Zone C1, with the majority of the lots in Zone D. Two parcels have an existing residence on each lot. Under the city's current zoning, these parcels, which are 1.5 acres or less, could not be further subdivided to accommodate an additional single-family home. The third lot is 3 acres in size and vacant. Only a small portion (0.3 acres) of the lot lies in Zone C1. Theoretically, under current zoning the vacant property could be subdivided to accommodate two single-family homes. The proposed ALUCP would allow this residential lot split provided that the future residences are sited in Zone D rather than Zone C1. Since only a small portion of the property is in Zone C1 and this area is constrained by road setback requirements and steep hillside slopes, siting the homes in Zone D is anticipated to be the only real viable option. As such, no conflict is anticipated in Zone C1.

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

## 12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) <b>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <b>Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

a, b) The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of mineral resources, both known and unknown. However, the proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to mineral resources. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

**13. NOISE**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project result in:</b>				
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a – d, f): See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of noise standards and sensitive receptors, both known and unknown. Because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to the environment that would directly or indirectly result in exposing persons to noise or generating noise.

e) The proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any physical change to the environment. Pursuant to the State Aeronautics Act, the purpose of the ALUCP is to minimize the public's exposure to aircraft noise within the Airport vicinity. Therefore, adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would not expose people residing and working in the vicinity of the Airport to excessive noise or generate new sources of aviation-related noise.

Airport-related noise and its impacts on land uses were considered in the proposed ALUCP criteria. In accordance with PUC Section 21675(a), the noise contours developed for use in the ALUCP reflect the potential long-term noise impact associated with aircraft operations for at least 20 years. The noise contours represent approximately 180,000 annual aircraft operations by 2033. The noise contours are described in terms of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), the metric adopted by the State of California for land use planning purposes.

The noise contours presented on Exhibit 5 and ALUCP policy maps reflect future aircraft activity on the runway configuration as presented in the FAA-approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP) of February 2003. The California Department of Transportation's Division of Aeronautics requires that an FAA-approved ALP serve as the basis of an ALUCP whenever possible. The ALUCP does not regulate the operation of aircraft or the noise produced by that activity. State law explicitly denies the ALUC authority over such matters.

The ALUCP establishes criteria that reduce the potential exposure of people to excessive aircraft-related noise by limiting residential densities (dwelling units per acre) and noise-sensitive land uses in locations exposed to noise higher than 60 dB CNEL. The airport noise contours were one of four compatibility factors used to establish the compatibility zones for the proposed ALUCP. The ALUCP establishes criteria that reduce the potential exposure of people to excessive aircraft-related noise by limiting residential densities (dwelling units per acre) and other noise-sensitive land uses in locations exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dB CNEL or higher. Thus, the proposed ALUCP for Brackett Field would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

**Mitigation: None required.**

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None**

**14. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a, d) Adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would not be growth inducing as the plan is regulatory in nature and does not propose any project that would cause physical development to occur. Additionally, policies set forth in the proposed ALUCP do not directly or indirectly induce population growth either locally or regionally beyond what is considered in the general plans and/or other land use policy instruments adopted by the County of Los Angeles and Cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona and San Dimas are the six general purpose government entities having land use jurisdiction in the proposed Airport Influence Area. In fact, the provisions of the proposed ALUCP limit the location, distribution, and density (dwelling units per acre) of future residential uses and the usage intensity (number of people per acre) of future nonresidential uses in the Airport Influence Area to minimize potential noise and safety concerns. However, these limitations can have the potential of displacing future development to locations outside the Airport Influence Area. This topic is covered below.

b, c) As described above, and discussed in Section 11 (Land Use and Planning Element), the proposed ALUCP is a guidance document that sets forth policies that influence the location, distribution, and density/intensity of both residential and nonresidential land uses in a way that is intended to reduce potential noise impacts and safety concerns. The noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight policies contained in the proposed ALUCP only affect planned land uses. In accordance with PUC Section 21674(a), the policies of the ALUCP do not apply to existing land uses, whether or not they are consistent with the criteria of the ALUCP. Therefore, adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would not result in the displacement of existing housing units or persons. As such, construction of replacement housing would not be required.

### **Potential Displacement of Future Housing**

Jurisdictions are mandated by state law to accommodate their share of the regional housing needs (Government Code Section 65580). State law also requires jurisdictions to amend their respective general plans to be consistent with the ALUCP or to take special steps to overrule the ALUC (Public Utilities Code Section 21676(a)). Modifying a general plan for consistency with the ALUCP has the potential to restrict a jurisdiction's ability to satisfy its share of the regional housing needs, as the ALUCP may preclude or limit the future development of housing units within portions of the Airport Influence Area.

As indicated above in Section 11, Land Use and Planning, the City of San Dimas' Single-Family, Very Low Density designation for the Specific Plan No. 8 (SP-8) area conflicts with the density limits included in the proposed ALUCP for Compatibility Zones B1 and C1. The SP-8 designation allows a density of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The SP-8 area is essentially comprised of one-acre lots on sloping hillside sites. The existing density for the SP-8 area is 1 dwelling unit per acre. The proposed ALUCP limits residential densities in Zones B1 and C1 to one single-family home on a legal lot of record, zoned for residential use at the time of ALUCP adoption (see ALUCP Policy 1.5.3). Therefore, the proposed ALUCP could theoretically displace up to two dwelling units on each one-acre lot that is vacant or underutilized.

### **Impact Analysis**

The purpose of the displacement analysis is to determine whether the proposed ALUCP could impact the City's ability in meeting its share of the regional housing needs. The displacement analysis is summarized in **Exhibit 8** below. **Exhibit 8** identifies the assessor parcel number that is affected by the proposed ALUCP and the displacement potential of each affected parcel. The displacement calculations omit parcels that are land locked (i.e., no feasible way of providing vehicle access to the site) or severely constrained by terrain (i.e., undevelopable). As indicated in **Exhibit 8**, adoption of the proposed ALUCP could displace up to 12 residential units in the City of San Dimas.

The City's Housing Element indicates that the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) for San Dimas is 625 new units for the 2008-2014 period. The City's residential capacity is 444 additional units, which leaves a deficiency of 181 units. However, Table IV-1, *Developable Available Residential Sites*, of the City's Housing Element indicates that although the SP-8 designation permits a density of 3 dwelling units per acre,

the true development potential for this area is 1 dwelling unit per acre. This density reflects the existing development pattern for the SP-8 area. Therefore, the theoretic displacement potential of 12 residential units identified in **Exhibit 8** below is deemed to be overstated for the following reasons:

- The City’s Housing Element acknowledges that the true density potential for the SP-8 area is 1 dwelling unit per acre;
- The SP-8 area is characterized by 1 acre lots; and
- The proposed ALUCP would allow one dwelling unit on each residential lot.

Therefore, for the purposes of this Initial Study, the theoretic displacement potential for the City of San Dimas is anticipated to be less than significant.

<b>Exhibit 8 - Theoretic Displacement Potential</b>					
<b>Assessor Parcel Number</b>	<b>Parcel Size (Acres)</b>	<b>Development Potential Under Current Zoning (Units)</b>	<b>ALUCP Zone</b>	<b>Development Potential Under Proposed ALUCP (Units)</b>	<b>Theoretical Displacement Potential (Units)</b>
8382017004*	0.84	2	B1	1	1
8382017004*	0.42	1	C1	1	0
8382017008*	0.47	1	B1	1	0
8382017008*	0.44	1	C1	1	0
8382017009*	0.37	1	B1	1	0
8382017009*	0.70	2	C1	1	1
8382017011	1.13	3	C1	1	2
8382017012	1.14	2  (3 units – 1 existing unit)	C1	1	1
8382017018	0.92	2	B1	1	1

8382017019	0.99	3	B1	1	2
8382017024	0.89	2	C1	1	1
8382018005	0.44	1	B1	1	0
8382018040	1.26	3	B1	1	2
8382018041	0.88	2	B1	1	1
8382018905	0.26	1	B1	1	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>27</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

\* Parcel affected by more than one compatibility zone. Acreage reflects portion of property within the noted compatibility zone.

**Mitigation:** None required.

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures:** None

**15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</b>				
<b>Fire protection?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Sheriff protection?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Schools?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Parks?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Libraries?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Other public facilities?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a) See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). Adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would create a temporary increase in the staff workloads as a result of the state requirement to modify the local general plan to be consistent with the ALUCP. As described on page 3-4 of this Initial Study, minor changes and/or additions would be needed to bring the affected jurisdictions general plans into consistency with the proposed ALUCP. Over the long term, procedural policies included in ALUCP will simplify and clarify the ALUC project review process, thereby reducing the workload for ALUC staff and the various jurisdictions' planning staffs.

**Mitigation: None required.**

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None**

## 16. RECREATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a - c) The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to recreation. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4)

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

**17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a – b, d – g): See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

c) Neither the ALUC nor the policies set forth in the proposed ALUCP have authority over airport operations. However, in accordance with state law, certain airport development proposals that could have off-airport compatibility implications will be subject to ALUC review. Nonetheless, adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP will not result in any change to air traffic patterns at Brackett Field.

Mitigation: None required.

Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures: None

**18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Briefly describe the proposed project, the environmental and/or regulatory setting related to all of the questions above, and your environmental determination.

a – g) The proposed ALUCP does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, the proposed ALUCP would not result in any direct impacts to utilities and service systems. See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4).

**Mitigation:** None required.

**Other Applicable/Adopted Mitigation Measures:** None

**19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of environmental resources, both known and unknown. Because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to existing land uses or the environment that would directly or indirectly result in a substantial adverse effect on the environment or human beings or substantially degrade the environment.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of environmental resources, both known and unknown. Because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to existing land uses or the environment that would directly or indirectly result in a substantial adverse effect on the environment or human beings or substantially degrade the environment.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed ALUCP is regulatory and does not propose any physical changes to the environment. Although some potential areas of concern were identified (see Section 11) between the proposed

ALUCP and Old Town La Verne Specific Plan and the Fairplex Plan, these inconsistencies were considered to be less than significant. Although some staff effort will be required to revise the City and County general plans to implement the ALUCP, this effort would be temporary and result in a simplified review process following implementation. No contribution to cumulative land use impacts would occur.

In addition, the proposed ALUCP addresses potential noise and safety impacts and other airport land use compatibility issues associated with potential future development that other public entities or private parties may propose within the Airport Influence Area. Therefore, adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP would prevent persons associated with future land uses from being exposed to significant negative noise or safety hazards associated with living or working in the airport influence area. Adoption and implementation of the proposed ALUCP has no potential to create cumulatively significant environmental impacts.

**d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**                       

See Summary of Potential Environmental Effects (page 3-4). The proposed Airport Influence Area has the potential to contain a wide variety of environmental resources, both known and unknown. Because the proposed ALUCP is regulatory in nature; it does not propose any new development, construction or physical change to existing land uses or the environment that would directly or indirectly result in a substantial adverse effect on the environment or human beings or substantially degrade the environment.

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**ALUCP**



Los Angeles County  
**Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan**



Los Angeles County  
Airport Land Use Commission

November 23, 2015 Draft

Prepared By



Santa Rosa, California  
[www.meadhunt.com](http://www.meadhunt.com)

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	
	Overview .....	1-1
	Preparation of the Brackett Field ALUCP .....	1-3
	ALUCP Preparation and Review Process .....	1-4
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Compatibility Policies</b>	
	1. Basic Provisions.....	2-1
	1.1 General Applicability .....	2-1
	1.2 Definitions .....	2-3
	1.3 Geographic Scope.....	2-6
	1.4 Actions Subject to ALUC Review .....	2-7
	1.5 Limitations of this Compatibility Plan.....	2-8
	2. Land Use Compatibility Criteria .....	2-10
	2.1 Basic Criteria for Review of Land Use Actions.....	2-10
	2.2 Noise Compatibility Policies .....	2-13
	2.3 Safety Compatibility Policies .....	2-15
	2.4 Airspace Protection Compatibility Policies.....	2-25
	2.5 Overflight Compatibility Policies .....	2-28
	2.6 Policies for Special Circumstances .....	2-31
	2.7 Site-Specific Exceptions.....	2-33
	<i>Figures</i>	
	1 Transferring Usage Intensity.....	2-12
	2 Intensity Calculation Example .....	2-20
	3 Site Split by Compatibility Zones .....	2-22
	<i>Tables</i>	
	2A Basic Compatibility Criteria.....	2-39
	2B Compatibility Zone Delineation.....	2-44
	<i>Maps</i>	
	2A Compatibility Policy Zones .....	ff 2-44
	2B Airspace Protection Map .....	ff 2-44
	2C Site-Specific Exception Areas .....	ff 2-44
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Background Data: Brackett Field Airport and Environs</b>	
	Overview .....	3-1
	Brackett Field Airport.....	3-1
	Surrounding Land Uses.....	3-4
	Exhibits.....	3-4
	<i>Exhibits</i>	
	1 Airport Location .....	ff 3-6
	2 Airport Features Summary .....	ff 3-6
	3A Airport Layout Plan (2003) .....	ff 3-6
	3B Airport Layout Plan (2010) .....	ff 3-6
	4 Airport Activity Data Summary.....	ff 3-6
	5 Noise and Overflight Factors Map .....	ff 3-6
	6 Safety Factors Map .....	ff 3-6
	7 Airport Proximity Disclosure Map.....	ff 3-6

**Chapter 3      Background Data: Brackett Field Airport and Environs**

*Exhibits (Cont'd)*

8	Airfield Environs Information.....	ff 3-6
9A	Existing Land Uses .....	ff 3-6
9B	Existing Land Use Legend .....	ff 3-6
10A	General Plan Land Uses .....	ff 3-6
10B	General Plan Use Legend .....	ff 3-6

# Introduction

## OVERVIEW

This document, the *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Compatibility Plan)*, is designed to ensure that future land use development in the area surrounding Brackett Field Airport will be compatible with the airport's current and future aircraft activity. The *Compatibility Plan* establishes a set of criteria and other policies focusing on compatibility with regard to noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight concerns.

The *Compatibility Plan* is intended for adoption by the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). In accordance with provisions of the State Aeronautics Act, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission is designated to act as the Los Angeles County ALUC.<sup>1</sup> The *Compatibility Plan* will serve as a tool for use by the ALUC or the local agencies when state law or this *Compatibility Plan* require it to review plans, regulations or other land use actions within the airport influence for consistency with the *Compatibility Plan's* criteria.

Neither this *Compatibility Plan* nor the ALUC have authority over existing land uses or over the operation of the airport.<sup>2</sup>

## Local Agency Responsibilities

The ALUC has limited ability to implement the policies and criteria of the *Compatibility Plan*. This responsibility primarily rests with the local agencies having jurisdiction over land uses within the Brackett Field Airport influence area through their respective general plans, zoning ordinances, and project review processes.

The Brackett Field Airport influence area as defined herein extends approximately 2.7 miles from the airport runways. The specific local agencies having land use responsibilities within the airport influence area are:

- County of Los Angeles (unincorporated areas)
- City of Claremont
- City of Glendora
- City of La Verne
- City of Pomona
- City of San Dimas.

By statute, the *Compatibility Plan* also applies to school districts, community college districts, and special districts whose boundaries extend into the airport influence area.<sup>3</sup> The ALUC does not have jurisdiction over federal, state, and tribal agencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21670.2.

<sup>2</sup> Public Utilities Code Sections 21670(a)(2) and 21674(e).

<sup>3</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21670(f).

The Government Code establishes that each county and city affected by an ALUC compatibility plan must make its general plan and any applicable specific plans consistent with the ALUC's compatibility plan within 180 days from adoption of the compatibility plan.<sup>4</sup> Alternatively, local agencies can undertake the series of steps listed in the Public Utilities Code to overrule the ALUC determination that the general plan or specific plan is not consistent with the compatibility plan.<sup>5</sup>

The other responsibility of local agencies—including school, community college, and special districts—is to refer their plans and certain other proposed land use actions to the ALUC, when required by Section 1.4, for review so that the ALUC can determine whether those actions are consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*.

### **Relationship to ALUC Review Procedures**

The policies directly associated with evaluation of land use compatibility for Brackett Field Airport are contained within this document. The procedures are enumerated in Chapter 1 and the policies are enumerated in Chapter 2. A separate volume entitled *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission Review Procedures (Review Procedures)*, administratively adopted by the ALUC in December 2004, establishes the procedures to be followed by the commission and affected local agencies. The *Review Procedures* apply not only to compatibility planning for Brackett Field Airport, but also to other airports in or affecting Los Angeles County.

The *Review Procedures* document is an integral part of this *Compatibility Plan* for Brackett Field Airport. The introduction to the *Review Procedures* document describes the authority and function of ALUCs as provided by state law, a description of the Los Angeles County ALUC, its relationship to county and city governments, and other general information. Also included are copies of current state laws concerning airport land use compatibility planning, federal regulations governing airspace protection, and other background material, all of which are significant to compatibility planning in the Brackett Field vicinity. In conjunction with use of this *Compatibility Plan*, reference must be made to the *Review Procedures* document.

### **Relationship to Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code, Sections 21674 and 21675, the ALUC is required to prepare and adopt an airport land use compatibility plan for each of its airports.

On December 19, 1991, the ALUC adopted the *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP)*, also known as the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), for the fifteen public-use airports in Los Angeles County. For each airport, the ALUC adopted planning boundaries, also known as the airport influence area, within which certain proposed land use actions must be submitted to the ALUC for review. Out of the fifteen airports, only General William J. Fox Airfield has an adopted individualized airport land use compatibility plan.

When adopted by the ALUC, this *Compatibility Plan* will constitute the second individualized airport land use compatibility plan within Los Angeles County and will supersede the portion of the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan applicable to Brackett Field Airport.

---

<sup>4</sup> Government Code Section 65302.3.

<sup>5</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21676.

## PREPARATION OF THE BRACKETT FIELD ALUCP

### ALUCP Preparation Guidelines

The primary guidelines for preparation of compatibility plans are contained in the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook)* published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics. As required by state law, the Los Angeles County ALUC has been guided by the compatibility information contained in the *Handbook* in preparation of this *Compatibility Plan*. The *Handbook* is not regulatory in nature, however, and it does not constitute formal state policy except to the extent that it explicitly refers to state laws. Rather, its guidance is intended to serve as the starting point for compatibility planning around individual airports.

The policies and maps in this *Compatibility Plan* rely upon the guidance provided by the current, October 2011, edition of the *Handbook*. The *Handbook* is available for downloading from the Division of Aeronautics web site ([www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut)).

An additional function of the *Handbook* is established elsewhere in California state law. The Public Resources Code creates a tie between the *Handbook* and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. This statute requires lead agencies to use the *Handbook* as “a technical resource” when assessing airport-related noise and safety impacts of projects located in the vicinity of airports.<sup>6</sup>

### Relationship to Airport Master Plan

#### *Airport Layout Plan*

State law (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)) dictates that airport land use compatibility plans be based upon an adopted airport master plan report or, alternatively, an airport layout plan drawing. If the airport has an adopted master plan, it is used. Where an airport master plan does not exist or is outdated, an airport layout plan drawing can serve as the basis for compatibility planning, subject to acceptance by the California Division of Aeronautics. When an airport layout plan is to be used, Caltrans practice is to require a version approved by the Federal Aviation Administration, if available. In either case, the key features of the airport plans relevant to a compatibility plan are the current and future configuration of the runways, the types and configuration of visual and instrument approach procedures, the types of aircraft that operate at the airport, and the projected volume of aircraft operations.

As noted in Chapter 3 of this *Compatibility Plan*, the last master plan report for Brackett Field was prepared in 1992. In contrast, the airport layout plan drawing has been updated on several occasions since that time. The most recent FAA-approved airport layout plan, dated February 2003, was submitted to Caltrans and accepted by that agency for compatibility planning purposes in May 2013 and has been used as the basis for this *Compatibility Plan*.<sup>7</sup>

#### *Activity Forecasts*

In addition to the requirement that a compatibility plan be based upon the adopted airport master plan or state-accepted airport layout plan, the Public Utilities Code says that a compatibility plan must reflect

<sup>6</sup> Public Resources Code Section 21096.

<sup>7</sup> As of the date of this draft *Compatibility Plan*, the most recent airport layout plan for Brackett Field is one dated April 2010. This version, however, contains only minor revisions reflecting building locations and has not been submitted to the FAA for formal approval.

“the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next 20 years.”<sup>8</sup> Frequently, unless the master plan is very recent, its forecasts cannot be directly used because they do not cover the requisite 20-year time period. Extension of the forecasts to cover at least 20 years is therefore necessary.

Also to be considered, as pointed out in the *Handbook*, is that...

“For compatibility planning, however, 20 years may be shortsighted. For most airports, a lifespan of more than 20 years can reasonably be presumed. Moreover, the need to avoid incompatible land use development will exist for as long as an airport exists. Once development occurs near an airport, it is virtually impossible—or, at the very least, costly and time consuming—to modify the land uses to ones that are more compatible with airport activities.”<sup>9</sup>

This factor combined with the characteristic uncertainty of forecasting suggests that, for the purpose of airport land use compatibility planning, using a high, but plausible, estimate of long-range activity levels is generally preferable to underestimating the future potential. This strategy especially applies with respect to assessment of noise impacts. Too low of a forecast may allow compatibility conflicts that cannot later be undone.

Because the Brackett Field Airport master plan is antiquated and thus no longer relevant for compatibility planning purposes, a new forecast was developed taking into account the above guidance and the historical activity at the airport. The background information and analysis is documented in Chapter 3. The resulting forecast used for this *Compatibility Plan* assumes that Brackett Field could experience as much as 180,000 aircraft operations, though not more than this, within the 20-year planning time frame. This activity level is approximately double that of 2014, but more than 100,000 operations less than the 1990 historical high of nearly 290,000 operations.

Additional background information concerning Brackett Field and its environs is found in Chapter 3 herein. This information serves to document the airport features and aircraft activity assumptions upon which the *Compatibility Plan* is based.

## ALUCP PREPARATION AND REVIEW PROCESS

Preparation of the *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* began in September 2012. To provide input to the planning process, a Working Group was formed by the ALUC staff. The Working Group included staff of the County Department of Public Works Aviation Division as the airport owner, the County Chief Executive Office and the Fairplex Association as owner and operator respectively of the Los Angeles County Fairplex Facility located adjacent to the Airport, representatives of the planning departments of the affected cities, and staff of the California Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division. The group met on several occasions during the course of the project. Additionally, ALUC staff conducted a series of meetings with local airport and homeowners groups and others having an interest in the outcome of the planning process. ALUC staff also has kept the ALUC apprised of the status of the plan preparation and community outreach throughout this period.

In conjunction with preparation and review of this *Compatibility Plan*, an Initial Study has been prepared and circulated to meet California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. The Initial Study indicated that a Negative Declaration can be used for adoption purposes and that an Environmental Impact Report is not necessary.

---

<sup>8</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a).

<sup>9</sup> *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (2011 edition), p. 3-5.

# Compatibility Policies

## 1. BASIC PROVISIONS

### 1.1. General Applicability

#### Overview

The purpose of this *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Compatibility Plan)* is to articulate procedural policies and compatibility criteria, established in accordance with the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21670 et seq.), applicable to airport land use compatibility planning in the vicinity of Brackett Field Airport. Specifically, Section 21670(a)(2) states that:

“It is the purpose of this article to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses.”

The lead responsibility for airport land use compatibility planning in Los Angeles County rests with the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission (RPC). The RPC is explicitly designated in the State Aeronautics Act as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for Los Angeles County (Public Utilities Code Section 21670.2)

The *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* incorporates the *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Procedures (Review Procedures)* by reference. The *Review Procedures* were administratively adopted by the ALUC on December 1, 2004, and are applicable to compatibility planning around all of the public-use and military airports in the county. The compatibility criteria by which proposed land use actions in the vicinity of Brackett Field are to be evaluated are provided in this *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* volume and where a review procedure herein is silent, the *Review Procedures* control.

1.1.1. The *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission Review Procedures (Review Procedures)* are hereby deemed part of and incorporated into this *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Compatibility Plan)* except as noted in Paragraph (b) of this policy or explicitly indicated in the policies herein.

(a) As the *Review Procedures* are administrative in nature and are applicable to compatibility planning around all public-use and military airports in Los Angeles County, any future updates to those procedures shall automatically apply to and become part of this *Compatibility Plan*.

Certain policies contained within this *Compatibility Plan* clarify, modify, or expand upon policies contained in the *Review Procedures*. Any conflicts between the *Review Procedures* and this *Compatibility Plan* shall be resolved in favor of the policies in this *Compatibility Plan*.

- 1.1.2. *Compatibility Plan Use by ALUC:* The ALUC shall make a *determination as to whether such action is consistent with the criteria set forth in this Compatibility Plan, when a land use action or airport action is referred for review as required by Section 1.4.*
- 1.1.3. *Compatibility Plan Use by Local Agencies:* This *Compatibility Plan* and its policies apply to local agencies (see definition in Section 1.2.21) in Los Angeles County that have, or may in the future have, control over lands within parts of the Brackett Field Airport influence area depicted on **Map 2A**, *Compatibility Zone Policy map*.
- (a) The affected local agencies are:
- (1) City of Claremont.
  - (2) City of Glendora.
  - (3) City of La Verne.
  - (4) City of Pomona.
  - (5) City of San Dimas.
  - (6) County of Los Angeles.
  - (7) Special districts, school districts, and community college districts to the extent that the district boundaries extend into the airport influence area.
- (b) The County of Los Angeles and each affected city shall:
- (1) Modify its respective general plan, applicable specific plan(s), zoning ordinance and building regulations to be consistent with the policies in this *Compatibility Plan*<sup>10</sup> within 180 days.
  - (2) Utilize this *Compatibility Plan*, either directly or as reflected in the appropriately modified general plan, specific plan and zoning ordinance, when making planning decisions regarding proposed development of lands with the Brackett Field Airport influence area.
  - (3) Refer proposed land use actions to the ALUC for review as specified in Section 1.4
- (c) Special districts, school districts, and community college districts shall:
- (1) Incorporate the relevant compatibility policies of this *Compatibility Plan* when creating plans and making other planning decisions regarding the proposed development of lands under their control with the Brackett Field Airport influence area.
  - (2) Refer proposed land use actions to the ALUC for review as specified in Section 1.4.
- (d) As the owner of Brackett Field Airport, the County of Los Angeles shall refer proposed airport master plans, airport layout plans and other airport improvement plans to the ALUC for review (see *Review Procedures* Sections 1.5.1(d) and 1.5.1(e)).
- 1.1.4. *Use by Federal, State, and Tribal Agencies:* Lands controlled (i.e., owned, leased, or in trust) by federal or state agencies or by Native American tribes are not subject to the provisions of the state ALUC statutes or this *Compatibility Plan*. However, the compatibility criteria included herein are intended as recommendations to these agencies.

---

<sup>10</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21676(a) specifically requires general plan consistency. Because specific plans and zoning ordinances are also subject to ALUC review, the consistency requirement also extends to them.

- 1.1.5. *Effective Date:* The policies in this *Compatibility Plan* shall become effective as of the date that the ALUC adopts this plan.

## 1.2. Definitions

The following definitions apply for the purposes of the policies set forth in this *Compatibility Plan*. Some terms are also defined in the *Review Procedures* and are included here for ease of reference. In some instances as noted, the definition in this section has been expanded or modified from the corresponding definition in the *Review Procedures*. In addition, general terms pertaining to airport and land use planning are defined in the *Review Procedures* Glossary of Terms (Appendix F of the *Review Procedures* document).

- 1.2.1. *Aeronautics Act:* Except as indicated otherwise, the article of the California Public Utilities Code (Sections 21670 *et seq.*) pertaining to airport land use commissions and airport land use compatibility planning.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.2. *Airport Influence Area:* An area, also known as the planning boundary, as delineated on **Map 2A**, *Compatibility Policy Zones map*, in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses. The airport influence area constitutes the area within which certain land use actions are subject to review to determine consistency with the policies herein.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.3. *Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC):* The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission, consisting of five members, acting in its capacity as the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.4. *Airport Land Use Commission Administrative Officer:* The Director of Planning for the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning or a person designated by the director.
- 1.2.5. *Airport Proximity Disclosure:* A form of buyer awareness documentation required by California state law and applicable to many transactions involving residential real estate including previously occupied dwellings. The disclosure notifies a prospective purchaser that the property is located in proximity to an airport and may be subject to annoyances and inconveniences associated with the flight of aircraft to, from, and around the airport. See Section 2.5.2 for applicability. Also see Section 1.2.29 for a related buyer awareness tool, *Recorded Overflight Notification*.
- 1.2.6. *Airspace Protection Area:* The area beneath the airspace protection surfaces for Brackett Field Airport as depicted on **Map 2B**, *Airspace Protection Map*.
- 1.2.7. *Airspace Protection Surfaces:* Imaginary surfaces in the airspace surrounding the Brackett Field Airport defined in accordance with criteria set forth in Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77. These surfaces, depicted on **Map 2B**, *Airspace Protection Map*, establish the maximum height that objects on the ground can reach without potentially creating constraints or hazards to the use of the airspace by aircraft approaching, departing, or maneuvering in the vicinity of the airport.
- 1.2.8. *Aviation-Related Use:* Any facility or activity directly associated with the air transportation of persons or cargo or the operation, storage, or maintenance of aircraft at an airport or

<sup>11</sup> Definition contained in *Review Procedures*, expanded or modified for purposes of this *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.

heliport. Such uses specifically include runways, taxiways, and their associated protection areas defined by the Federal Aviation Administration, together with aircraft aprons, hangars, fixed base operations facilities, terminal buildings, etc. Hotels or other commercial/industrial facilities on airport property do not qualify as an *aviation-related use*.<sup>11</sup>

- 1.2.9. *Avigation Easement*: An easement that conveys, typically to the entity owning the airport, rights associated with aircraft overflight of a property, including but not limited to creation of noise and limits on the height of structures and trees, etc. (see Appendix E of the *Review Procedures* document).<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.10. *Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)*: The noise metric adopted by the State of California for land use planning purposes, including describing airport noise impacts. The noise impacts are typically depicted by a set of contours, each of which represents points having the same CNEL value.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.11. *Compatibility Plan*: This document, the *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.12. *Compatibility Zone*: Any of the zones established herein that indicate where noise, safety, airspace protection, or overflight factors associated with Brackett Field Airport may represent a compatibility concern.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.13. *Density*: The number of dwelling units per acre. Density is used in this *Compatibility Plan* as the measure by which proposed residential development is evaluated for compliance with noise and safety compatibility criteria (compare with *intensity*). Density is calculated on the basis of the overall site size (i.e., gross acreage of the site).
- 1.2.14. *Development*: Land improvements requiring a permit from the local agency, except those identified in Section 1.5.2.
- 1.2.15. *Existing Land Use*: A land use that either physically exists or for which local government commitments to the proposal have been obtained; that is, no further discretionary approvals are necessary. Local government commitment to a proposal can usually be considered firm once one or more of the following have occurred: (a) A tentative parcel or subdivision map has been approved and not expired; (b) A vesting tentative parcel or subdivision map has been approved; (c) A development agreement has been approved and remains in effect; (d) A final subdivision map has been recorded; (e) A use permit or other discretionary entitlement has been approved and not yet expired; or (f) A valid building permit has been issued.
- 1.2.16. *Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77*: The part of Federal Aviation Regulations that deals with objects affecting navigable airspace in the vicinity of airports. Objects that exceed the Part 77 height limits constitute airspace obstructions.
- 1.2.17. *Impasse*: Any significant unresolved issue between the appellant public agency and the public agency proposing the project regarding proper airport planning as it relates to the project at issue.
- 1.2.18. *Infill*: Development of vacant or underutilized land within areas that are already largely developed or used more intensively. See *Review Procedures* Section 3.3.1 and Section 2.6.2 herein for criteria used to identify infill areas for the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan*.
- 1.2.19. *Intensity*: The number of people per acre. Intensity is used in this *Compatibility Plan* as the measure by which most proposed nonresidential development is evaluated for compliance

with safety compatibility criteria (compare with *density*). Sitewide average intensity is calculated on the basis of the overall site size (i.e., gross acreage of the site).

- 1.2.20. *Land Uses of Special Concern*: Land uses that represent special safety concerns irrespective of the number of people associated with the use (see Section 2.3.6). Specifically: uses with vulnerable occupants; hazardous materials storage; or critical community infrastructure.
- 1.2.21. *Local Agency*: The County of Los Angeles, any city, or other local governmental entity such as a special district, school district, or community college district—including any future city or district—having jurisdictional territory lying within the Brackett Field Airport influence area as defined herein. These entities are subject to the provisions of this *Compatibility Plan*.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.22. *Major Land Use Action*: Those actions listed in *Review Procedures* Section 1.5.3 plus the following:
- (a) Indoor or outdoor assembly facilities having a capacity of 300 people or more;
  - (b) Production or bulk storage of hazardous materials other than for on-site use; and
  - (c) Primary power plants.
- 1.2.23. *Noise Impact Area*: The area within which the noise impacts, measured in terms of CNEL, generated by the Brackett Field Airport may represent a land use compatibility concern as depicted on Exhibit 5, *Noise and Overflight Factors Map*, in Chapter 3.
- 1.2.24. *Noise-Sensitive Land Uses*: Land uses for which the associated primary activities, whether indoor or outdoor, are susceptible to disruption by loud noise events. The most common types of noise sensitive land uses include, but are not limited to, residential, hospitals, nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, educational facilities, libraries, museums, places of worship, child-care facilities, and certain types of passive recreational parks and open space where quiet is expected.
- 1.2.25. *Nonconforming Use*: An existing land use that does not comply with the compatibility criteria set forth in this *Compatibility Plan*. See Section 2.6.2 for criteria applicable to land use actions involving nonconforming uses.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.26. *Object Free Area (OFA)*: An area on the ground surrounding an airport runway within which the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) prohibits all objects except certain ones necessary for aircraft navigation or maneuvering. The OFA dimensions to be applied for the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan* are as established by the FAA.
- 1.2.27. *Project; Land Use Action; Development Proposal*: Terms similar in meaning and all referring to the types of land use matters, either publicly or privately sponsored, that are subject to the provisions of this *Compatibility Plan*.<sup>11</sup>
- 1.2.28. *Reconstruction*: The rebuilding of an existing nonconforming structure that has been fully or partially destroyed as a result of a calamity (as opposed to *redevelopment* which may involve intentional destruction of structures). See Section 2.6.4.
- 1.2.29. *Recorded Overflight Notification*: A form of buyer awareness documentation recorded in the chain of title of a property stating that the property may be subject to annoyances and inconveniences associated with the flight of aircraft to, from, and around a nearby airport. Unlike an *aviation easement* (see Section 1.2.9), a *recorded overflight notification* does not convey property rights from the property owner to the airport and does not restrict the height of

objects. See Section 2.5.1 for applicability. Also see Section 2.5.2 for a related buyer awareness tool, *airport proximity disclosure*.

- 1.2.30. *Redevelopment*: Any new construction that replaces the existing use of a site, particularly at a density or intensity greater than that of the existing use. Redevelopment projects are subject to the provisions of this *Compatibility Plan* to the same extent as other forms of proposed development.
- 1.2.31. *Reviewing Agency*: The agency, either the ALUC or a local agency, having the responsibility for reviewing land use actions for consistency with the policies in this *Compatibility Plan*.

### 1.3. Geographic Scope

#### 1.3.1. *Nature of Compatibility Concerns*:

- (a) Four types of airport land use compatibility concerns are addressed by the policies in this *Compatibility Plan*:
- (1) Noise: Locations exposed to potentially disruptive levels of aircraft noise.
  - (2) Safety: Areas where the risk of an aircraft accident poses heightened safety concerns for people and property on the ground.
  - (3) Airspace Protection: Places where height and various other land use characteristics need to be restricted in order to prevent creation of physical, visual, or electronic hazards to flight within the airspace required for operation of aircraft to and from the airport.
  - (4) Overflight: Locations where aircraft overflights can be intrusive and annoying to many people.

1.3.2. *Airport Impacts Not Considered*: Other impacts sometimes created by airports (e.g., air pollution, automobile traffic, etc.) are not addressed by these compatibility policies and are not subject to review by the Airport Land Use Commission. Also, in accordance with state law (Public Utilities Code Section 21674(e)), neither this plan nor the ALUC have authority over the operation of any airport (including where and when aircraft fly, airport security, and other such matters). *Airport Growth Assumptions*: The Brackett Field Airport influence area reflects the existing configuration of the airport, planned airfield improvements and projected aircraft activity covering the requisite 20-year planning horizon.<sup>12</sup> Chapter 3 documents the airport features and aeronautical activity assumptions upon which this *Compatibility Plan* is based.

- 1.3.3. *Brackett Field Airport Influence Area*: As defined in accordance with state law, the influence area of Brackett Field Airport (see **Map 2A**, *Compatibility Policy Zones map*) encompasses all lands on which the uses could be negatively affected by present or future aircraft operations at the airport as well as lands on which the uses could negatively affect airport usage.
- (a) In delineating the airport influence area, the geographic extent of the above four types of compatibility concerns are taken into account along with the current and future airfield configuration and long-term activity forecasts.
  - (b) Lands within the cities of La Verne, Pomona, and San Dimas are affected by all four of the above factors. Lands within the cities of Claremont and Glendora and the unin-

<sup>12</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a).

corporated area of Los Angeles County are affected only by the airspace protection and overflight factors.

#### 1.4. Actions Subject to ALUC Review

1.4.1. *Mandatory Referral of Land Use Actions:* Prior to approving any of the following types of land use planning actions, the local agency (see Section 1.2.20) always must refer the action to the ALUC for determination of consistency with this *Compatibility Plan*.<sup>13</sup>

- (a) Local agency adoption or approval of any new general or specific plan or any amendment thereto that affects lands within the Brackett Field Airport influence area. If it is determined by the ALUC Administrative Officer that such amendment or plan does not involve in any way the types of airport impact concerns listed in Section 1.3.1, then the Administrative Officer can make the consistency determination. Otherwise, the amendment or plan must be referred to the ALUC for its determination.
- (b) Local agency adoption or approval of a zoning ordinance or building regulation, including any proposed change or variance to any such ordinance or regulation, that affects land within the Brackett Field Airport influence area.
- (c) Adoption or modification of the master plan for Brackett Field Airport.
- (d) Any proposal for the expansion of Brackett Field airport or heliport, if such expansion will require an amended airport permit from the State.

1.4.2. *Mandatory Referral of Certain Land Use Actions:* In addition to the land use planning actions listed in Section 1.4.1 for which referral to the ALUC is always required, local agencies must also refer the following land use actions to the ALUC for review only until such time as either (1) The ALUC finds that a local agency's general plan or specific plan is consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*; or (2) For those local agencies, including the City of Pomona, the City of LaVerne, the City of Glendora, the City of San Dimas, and the City of Claremont, where the relevant Plans are deemed consistent upon the adoption of this *Compatibility Plan* through those agencies' collaboration with ALUC staff, any remaining portions that are contrary to this *Compatibility Plan* shall be made consistent with the *Compatibility Plan* within the 180 day period following its adoption, or the ALUC will continue to review :

- (a) Any major land use actions as defined in Section 1.2.22 Paragraphs (a), (b), or (c) affecting land within Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1, or C2.
- (b) For projects solely affecting lands within Compatibility Zones D or E, only the following major land use actions need to be referred for ALUC review:
  - Any obstruction having a height that requires review by the Federal Aviation Administration in accordance with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations.
  - Any project having the potential to create electrical or visual hazards to aircraft in flight, including: electrical interference with radio communications or navigational signals; lighting that could be mistaken for airport lighting; glare in the eyes of pilots of aircraft using the airport; and impaired visibility near the airport.

<sup>13</sup> Public Utilities Code Section 21676(b).

- Any project having the potential to cause an increase in the attractions of birds or other wildlife that can be hazardous to aircraft operations in the vicinity of the airport.
- The actions listed in Section 1.2.22 Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c).
- Proposed land acquisition of land for children's schools

1.4.3. *Voluntary Referral of Major Land Use Actions:* Referral of major land use actions is voluntary under the following conditions:<sup>14</sup>

- (a) After a local agency has revised its general plan or specific plan to be consistent with this *Compatibility Plan* (see *Review Procedures* Section 3.2) or has overruled the ALUC, referral of major land use actions for ALUC review is voluntary. The ALUC requests local agencies to continue to refer major land use actions as listed in Section 1.2.22 for informal review and comment. ALUC review of these types of projects can serve to enhance their compatibility with airport activity.
- (b) Referral of any proposed major land use action, as determined by the local agency, involving a question of compatibility with airport activities is voluntary. Lesser actions of types not included on the land use actions list may also be referred on a voluntary basis.
- (c) The ALUC Administrative Officer is authorized on behalf of the ALUC to provide comments on major land use actions referred to the ALUC on a voluntary basis.
- (d) Because the ALUC reviews of land use actions submitted in accordance with Paragraph (b) of this section do not represent formal consistency determinations as is the case with actions referred under Section 1.4.1, local agencies are not required to adhere to the overruling process if they elect to approve a project without incorporating design changes or conditions recommended by the ALUC or ALUC Administrative Officer.

## 1.5. Limitations of this Compatibility Plan

1.5.1. *Airport Operations:* In general, neither the ALUC nor this *Compatibility Plan* have authority over the operation of Brackett Field Airport including where and when aircraft fly, the types of aircraft flown, and other aspects of aviation.<sup>15</sup>

- (a) State law requires ALUC review of airport master plans and certain development plans to the extent that aviation-related facilities or activities could have off-airport land use compatibility implications (see *Review Procedures* Sections 1.5.1(c) and 1.5.1 (d)).<sup>16</sup>
- (b) Nonaviation development of airport property is subject to ALUC review in the same manner that ALUC review is required for non-aviation development actions off airport property. The review may take place as part of an airport master plan or on an individual development project basis (see *Review Procedures* Section 1.5.3(b)).

1.5.2. *Existing Land Uses:* The policies of this *Compatibility Plan* do not apply to existing land uses.

<sup>14</sup> Once the conditions indicated in Section 1.4.2 have been met, the ALUC no longer has authority under state law to require that all actions, regulations, and permits be referred for review. However, the ALUC and the local agency can agree that the ALUC should continue to receive, review, and comment upon individual projects.

<sup>15</sup> This is an explicit limitation of state law under Public Utilities Code Section 21674(e) and also of federal law and aviation regulations.

<sup>16</sup> See Public Utilities Code Sections 21676(c) and 21664.5.

- (a) **Qualifying Criteria:** An existing land use is one that either physically exists or for which local agency commitments to the proposal have been obtained prior to the effective date of this Compatibility Plan in one or more of the following manners:
  - (1) A tentative parcel or subdivision map has been approved and not yet expired;
  - (2) A vesting tentative parcel or subdivision map has been approved and not yet expired;
  - (3) A development agreement has been approved and remains in effect;
  - (4) A final subdivision map has been recorded;
  - (5) A conditional use permit or other discretionary entitlement has been approved and not yet expired; or
  - (6) A valid building permit has been issued and not yet expired.
- (b) **Revisions to Approved Development:** Filing of a new version of any of the approval documents listed in Paragraph (a) of this section means that the use no longer qualifies as existing land use and, therefore, is subject to review in accordance with Section 1.4.
- (c) **Expiration of Local Agency Commitment:** If a local agency's commitment to a development proposal, as set forth in Paragraph (a) of this section, expires, the proposal will no longer qualify as an existing land use,

1.5.3. *Development by Right:*

- (a) Nothing in this *Compatibility Plan* prohibits:
  - (1) Construction of a single-family home on a legal lot of record as of the effective date of this *Compatibility Plan* provided that the home is not within Compatibility Zone A and the use is permitted by local land use regulations.
  - (2) Construction of a secondary unit as defined by state law and local regulations.
  - (3) Lot line adjustments provided that new developable parcels would not be created and the resulting density or intensity of the affected property would not exceed the applicable criteria indicated in **Table 2A**, *Basic Compatibility Criteria*.
  - (4) Construction or establishment of a family day care home serving 14 or fewer children either in an existing dwelling or in a new dwelling permitted by the policies of this *Compatibility Plan*.
- (b) The sound attenuation and avigation easement dedication requirements set by Policies 2.2.2 and 2.6.1 shall apply to development permitted under this policy.

## 2. LAND USE COMPATIBILITY CRITERIA

### 2.1. Compatibility Criteria for Review of Land Use Actions

2.1.1. *Evaluating Compatibility of New Land Use Development:* The reviewing agency (see Section 1.2.30) shall evaluate the compatibility of proposed land uses within the Brackett Field Airport influence area in accordance with the criteria and maps included in this section.

- (a) The criteria listed in **Table 2A**, *Basic Compatibility Criteria*, together with the compatibility zones depicted on **Map 2A**, *Compatibility Policy Zones* shall be the primary basis for determining whether a proposed land use project will be compatible with Brackett Field Airport activity. For most land use projects, **Table 2A** and **Map 2A** will be sufficient to determine the project's compatibility. The table and map both take into account all four compatibility concerns—noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight.
- (b) Complex projects or ones for which the compatibility is indicated in **Table 2A** as “conditional” may require more detailed evaluation using the specific noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight compatibility policies set forth in Sections 2.2 through 2.5 and policies for special circumstances outlined in Section 2.6 of this chapter.
- (c) **Table 2B**, *Compatibility Zone Factors*, identifies the relative contributions of noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight factors to the delineation of each of the compatibility zones in **Map 2A**. This information can be used to help assess how heavily each compatibility factor should be weighed when evaluating proposed projects in a particular zone. It also can serve to suggest what types of modifications to the project might make the proposal acceptable, given the project's degree of sensitivity to a particular compatibility factor. (For example, knowing that a noise-sensitive type of land use is in a high-noise zone may indicate a need for sound attenuation in the structure, whereas a safety-sensitive land use in a high-risk zone may need to be altered to reduce the number of people present.)

2.1.2. *Basic Compatibility Criteria Table:* Each of the land use categories listed in **Table 2A** is indicated as being either “normally compatible,” “conditional,” or “incompatible” depending upon the compatibility zone in which it is located.

- (a) These terms are defined to mean the following:
  - (1) “Normally Compatible” means that normal examples of the use are presumed to comply with the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight criteria set forth in this chapter. Atypical examples of a use may require review to ensure compliance with usage intensity and height limit criteria.
  - (2) “Conditional” means that the proposed land use is compatible if the indicated usage intensity and other listed conditions are met. For the purposes of these policies, “avoid” is intended as cautionary guidance, not a prohibition of the use.
  - (3) “Incompatible” means that the use should not be permitted under any normal circumstances. Limited exceptions are possible for site-specific special conditions. See Section 2.1.5.
- (b) Multiple land use categories and the compatibility criteria associated with them may apply to a project. See Policy 2.1.3 regarding development having both residential and

nonresidential uses and Section 2.3.2(f) regarding uses having a mixture of only non-residential uses.

- (c) Land uses not specifically listed in **Table 2A** shall be evaluated using the criteria for similar listed uses.
- (d) For details regarding usage intensity criteria indicated in **Table 2A** see the safety compatibility policies in Section 2.3.

2.1.3. *Mixed Residential and Nonresidential Development:* For projects involving a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses, the following policies apply:

- (a) Where the residential development and nonresidential development are proposed to be situated on separate parts of the project site, the project shall be evaluated as separate developments.
  - (1) The residential density shall be calculated with respect to the area(s) to be devoted to residential development and the nonresidential intensity calculated with respect to the area(s) proposed for nonresidential uses.
  - (2) This provision means that the residential density cannot be averaged over the entire project site when nonresidential uses will occupy some of the area. The same limitation applies in reverse—that is, the nonresidential intensity cannot be averaged over an area that includes residential uses.
- (b) Development in which residential uses are proposed to be located in conjunction with nonresidential uses in the same or nearby buildings on the same site must meet both residential density and nonresidential intensity criteria.
  - (1) The number of dwelling units shall not exceed the density limits indicated in **Table 2A Basic Compatibility Criteria**.
  - (2) Additionally, the normal number of occupants of the residential portion shall be added to that of the nonresidential portion and the total occupancy shall be evaluated with respect to the nonresidential usage intensity criteria cited in **Table 2A**. The reviewing agency may make exceptions to this provision if the residential and nonresidential components of the development would clearly not be simultaneously occupied to their maximum intensities.
- (c) Mixed-use development shall not be allowed where the residential component would be situated in a compatibility zone where residential development is indicated as “Incompatible” in **Table 2A**.

2.1.4. *Parcels Lying within Two or More Compatibility Zones:* For the purposes of evaluating consistency with the compatibility criteria in **Table 2A**, any parcel that is split by compatibility zone boundaries shall be considered as if it were multiple parcels divided at the compatibility zone boundary line.

- (a) The preceding notwithstanding, where no part of the building(s) or areas of outdoor congregation of people proposed on the project site fall within the more restrictive compatibility zone, the criteria for the compatibility zone where the proposed building(s) or outdoor uses are located shall be applied to the entire parcel.

(b) Modification of the project site plan so as to transfer the allowed density of residential development or intensity of nonresidential development from the more restricted portion to the less restricted portion is encouraged. The purpose of this policy is to move people outside of the higher-risk zones.

- (1) This full or partial reallocation of density or intensity is permitted even if the resulting intensity in the less restricted area would then exceed the sitewide average density or intensity limits that apply within that compatibility zone (see **Figure 1**). However, transferring of density or intensity to a zone in which the proposed use is listed as incompatible is not allowed.
- (2) The single-acre intensity criterion for the zone to which the use is transferred must still be satisfied.

**Figure 1: Transferring Usage Intensity**

An example of transferring usage intensity to the less restrictive safety zone is provided below.

**Project Site**

- Zone B1: 1.0 acres
- Zone B2: 2.0 acres

**Allowable Total Occupancy**

- Zone B1: 80 people/acre = 80 people
- Zone B2: 150 people/acre = 300 people
- Total Allowed on Site: 380 people

**Allowable Single-Acre Occupancy**

- Zone B2: 450 people

**Transfer People from Zone B1 to Zone B2**

- Zone B1: 0 people
- Zone B2: 380 people

\* 380 people in 2.0 acres exceeds the 150 people/average acre limit for ZoneB2, but is allowable under usage intensity transfer policy and would not exceed the single acre limit of 450 people

2.1.5. *Special Conditions Exception:* The policies and criteria set forth in this *Compatibility Plan* are intended to be applicable to all locations within the Brackett Field Airport influence area. However, there may be specific situations where a normally incompatible use can be considered compatible because of terrain, specific location, or other extraordinary factors or circumstances related to the site.<sup>17</sup>

2.1.6. The granting of a special conditions exception requires referral of the *action to the ALUC*, except as otherwise provided for in Section 2.7. The burden for demonstrating that special conditions apply to a particular development proposal rests with the project proponent and/or referring local agency, not with the ALUC.

- (a) After due consideration of all the factors involved in such situations and consultation with Brackett Field Airport management, the ALUC may find a normally incompatible use to be acceptable.
- (b) In considering any such exceptions, the ALUC shall also take into account the potential for the use of a building to change over time. A building could have planned low-intensity use initially, but later be converted to a higher-intensity use. Local agency permit language or other mechanisms to ensure continued compliance with the usage intensity criteria must be put in place.
- (c) In reaching such a decision, the ALUC shall make specific findings as to why the exception is being made and that the land use will neither create a safety hazard to people on the ground or aircraft in flight nor result in excessive noise exposure for the proposed use or will show how risks are mitigated. Findings also shall be made as to the nature of the extraordinary circumstances that warrant the policy exception.

<sup>17</sup> This policy extends *Review Procedures* Section 3.3.7 with the addition of sub-sections 2.1.6 (c) and (e).

- (d) Approval of a special conditions exception for a proposed project shall require a two-thirds approval of the ALUC members voting on the matter and shall not be delegated to the ALUC Administrative Officer for approval.
- (e) The granting of a special conditions exception shall be considered site specific and shall not be generalized to include other sites.

2.1.7. *Rare Special Events Exception:* Local agencies may make exceptions for “Conditional” or “Incompatible” land uses associated with rare special events (e.g., an air show at the airport, a street fair, or a golf tournament) for which a facility is not designed and normally not used and for which extra safety precautions will be taken as appropriate.

## 2.2. Noise Compatibility Policies

### NOISE COMPATIBILITY POLICIES BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Noise Compatibility Policies Background Information in this box has been considered in formulating the noise compatibility criteria in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only and does not itself constitute *Compatibility Plan* policy.

#### **Policy Objective**

The purpose of noise compatibility policies is to avoid establishment of noise-sensitive land uses in the portions of the airport environs that are exposed to significant levels of aircraft noise.

#### **Measures of Noise Exposure**

As is standard practice in California, this *Compatibility Plan* uses the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) metric as the primary basis for evaluating the degree to which lands around the airport are exposed to airport-related noise. CNEL is a cumulative noise metric in that it takes into account not just the loudness of individual noise events, but also the number of events over time. Cumulative exposure to aircraft noise is depicted by a set of contours, each of which represents points having the same CNEL value.

The Brackett Field Airport noise contours shown in **Exhibit 5, Noise and Overflight Factors Map**, in Chapter 3 were produced for this *Compatibility Plan* and reflect the projected airport activity levels documented in Exhibit 4, *Airport Activity Data Summary*. The noise contours represent the greatest annualized noise impact, measured in terms of CNEL, that is anticipated to be generated by the aircraft operating at the airport over the planning time frame. For the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan*, the contours are represented in the composite compatibility zones shown on **Map 2A, Compatibility Policy Map**, based upon the factors noted in **Table 2B, Compatibility Zone Factors**.

#### **Factors Considered in Setting Noise Compatibility Policies**

Factors considered in setting the policies in this section include the following:

- Established state regulations and guidelines, including noise compatibility recommendations in the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (2011).
- Ambient noise levels in the community, as well as noise from other transportation noise sources. Ambient noise levels influence the potential intrusiveness of aircraft noise upon a particular land use and vary greatly between rural, suburban, and urban communities.
- The extent to which noise would intrude upon and interrupt the activity associated with a particular use. Susceptibility to speech interference or sleep disturbance as a result of single-event noise levels is a factor in this regard. Noise levels above approximately 65 dBA are sufficient to cause speech interference. Examples of highly noise-sensitive land uses include residences, schools, libraries, and outdoor theaters.

- The extent to which the land use activity itself generates noise.
- The extent of outdoor activity, particularly noise-sensitive activities, associated with a particular land use.
- The extent to which indoor uses associated with a particular land use may be made compatible with application of sound attenuation. (Typical new building construction provides sufficient insulation to attenuate outdoor-to-indoor noise by at least 20 dB.)

2.2.1. *Maximum Acceptable Exterior Noise Exposure:* To minimize noise-sensitive development in noisy areas around Brackett Field Airport, new land use development shall be restricted in accordance with the following.

(a) New residential development shall be deemed incompatible within the projected CNEL 60 dB contour of Brackett Field Airport, except as allowed by right in accordance with Section 1.5.3. This contour is shown in **Exhibit 5, Noise and Overflight Factors Map**, in Chapter 3 of this *Compatibility Plan* and is one of the factors considered in establishing the *Compatibility Zone* boundaries in **Map 2A**. For the purposes of implementing this policy:

- (1) Within Compatibility Zones A, B1, or B2, no new dwelling shall be permitted, except as allowed by right in accordance with Section 1.5.3.
- (2) Within Compatibility Zone C1, no new dwelling shall be permitted except as allowed by right in accordance with Section 1.5.3 or where a site-specific exception has been established in accordance with Section 2.7.
- (3) Within Compatibility Zone C2, new multi-family residential within the density range indicated in **Table 2A** is allowed. New residential development should be avoided, including in locations within this zone outside the CNEL 60 dB contour. However, new residential development is acceptable if:
  - It complies with the infill criteria set forth in Section 2.6.2;
  - It incorporates sound attenuation as necessary to comply with the interior noise level conditions in Section 2.2.2;
  - It has a density no greater than allowed in accordance with Section 2.3.1 and
  - An aviation easement is dedicated to the County of Los Angeles in accordance with Section 2.6.1.

(b) New nonresidential development shall be deemed incompatible in locations where the airport-related noise exposure would be highly disruptive to the specific land use. Highly noise-sensitive land uses are flagged with a symbol (→) in **Table 2A**.

- (1) Local agencies and project proponents should exercise caution with regard to creation of new outdoor uses—the potential for aircraft noise to disrupt the activity should be evaluated.
- (2) Uses that are primarily indoors are acceptable if sound attenuation is provided in accordance with Section 2.2.2 and as noted in **Table 2A**.

2.2.2. *Maximum Acceptable Interior Noise Levels:* To minimize disruption of indoor activities by aircraft noise, new structures within any Compatibility Zone except D or E shall incorporate sound attenuation design features sufficient to meet the interior noise level criteria specified by this policy.

(a) For the following land uses, the aircraft-related interior noise level shall be no greater than CNEL 40 dB.

- (1) Any habitable room of single- or multi-family residences (including family day care homes with 14 or fewer children);
  - (2) Hotels, motels, and other lodging;
  - (3) Hospitals, nursing homes, and other congregate care facilities;
  - (4) Places of worship, meeting halls, theaters, and mortuaries; and
  - (5) Schools, libraries, and museums.
- (b) When structures are part of a proposed land use action, evidence that proposed structures will be designed to comply with the criteria in Paragraph (a) of this policy shall be submitted to the involved local agency as part of the building permit process. The calculations should assume that windows are closed. The local agency shall be responsible for assuring compliance.
- (c) The local agency may allow exceptions to the interior noise level criteria in Paragraph (a) of this policy where evidence is provided that the indoor noise generated by the use itself exceeds the listed criteria.

2.2.3. *Noise-Sensitive Land Uses:* The reviewing agency should consider single-event noise levels (that is, the noise produced by individual aircraft operations as opposed to the cumulative noise levels measured in terms of CNEL) when evaluating the compatibility of highly noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, libraries, and outdoor theaters. Susceptibility to speech interference and sleep disturbance are among the factors that make certain land uses noise sensitive. The compatibility evaluations in **Table 2A** take into account single-event noise concerns.

- (a) The reviewing agency may require acoustical studies or on-site noise measurements to assist in determining the compatibility of sensitive uses.
- (b) Single-event noise levels are especially important in areas that are regularly overflowed by aircraft, but that do not produce significant CNEL contours (helicopter overflight areas are a particular example). Flight patterns for Brackett Field Airport should be considered in the review process including in locations beyond the mapped noise contours.

### 2.3. Safety Compatibility Policies

#### **SAFETY COMPATIBILITY POLICIES BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Safety Compatibility Policies Background Information in this box has been considered in formulating the safety compatibility criteria in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only does not itself constitute *Compatibility Plan* policy.

#### ***Policy Objective***

The intent of land use safety compatibility policies is to minimize the risks associated with an off-airport aircraft accident or emergency landing. The policies focus on reducing the potential consequences of such events should they occur. Risks both to people and property in the vicinity of an airport and to people on board the aircraft are considered (land use features that can be the *cause* of an aircraft accident are addressed under Airspace Protection, Section 2.4).

#### ***Measures of Risk Exposure***

This *Compatibility Plan* evaluates the risk that potential aircraft accidents pose to lands and people around the airport in terms of two parameters: where aircraft accidents are most likely to occur near the airport; and the potential consequences if an accident occurs in one of those locations.

- The accident likelihood is measured in terms of the geographic distribution of where accidents have historically occurred around other airports having similar types of activity. Because aircraft accidents are infrequent occurrences, the pattern of accidents at any one airport cannot be used to predict where future accidents are most likely to happen around that airport. Reliance must be placed on data about aircraft accident locations at comparable airports nationally, refined with respect to information about the characteristics of aircraft use at the individual airport.
- The consequences component of the risk considers the number of people in harm's way and their ability to escape harm. For most nonresidential development, potential consequences are measured in terms of the usage intensity—the number of people per acre on the site. For residential development, density—the number of dwelling units per acre—is substituted for intensity. Additional criteria are applicable to specific types of uses.

### **Factors Considered in Setting Safety Compatibility Policies**

Factors considered in setting the policies in this section include the following:

- The runway length, approach categories, normal flight patterns, and aircraft fleet mix at Brackett Field Airport. These factors are reflected in the compatibility zone shapes and sizes.
- The locations, delineated with respect to the airport runway, where aircraft accidents typically occur near airports and the relative concentration of accidents within these locations. The most stringent land use controls are applied to the areas with the greatest potential accident exposure. The risk information utilized is the general aviation accident data and analyses contained in the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. The *Handbook* guidance regarding safety compatibility forms the basis for the safety component of the composite compatibility zones established for Brackett Field Airport in **Map 2A** and the maximum usage intensities (people per acre) criteria indicated in Section 2.3.2 and in **Table 2A**.
- *Handbook* guidance regarding residential densities in urban areas. Residential density limitations cannot be equated to the usage intensity limitations for nonresidential uses. Consistent with pervasive societal views and as suggested by the *Handbook* guidelines, a greater degree of protection is warranted for residential uses.
- The presence of certain land use characteristics that represent safety concerns regardless of the number of people present; specifically: vulnerable occupants (children, elderly, disabled), hazardous materials, and critical community infrastructure.
- The extent to which development covers the ground and thus limits the options of where an aircraft in distress can attempt an emergency landing.
- The extent to which the occupied parts of a project site are concentrated in a small area. Concentrated high intensities heighten the risk to occupants if an aircraft should strike the location where the development is concentrated. To guard against this risk, a limitation on the maximum concentrations of dwellings or people in a small area of a large project site is appropriate within the highest risk parts of the airport influence area.

2.3.1. *Residential Development Density Criteria:* Proposed residential development shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

- (a) Except as allowed by right in accordance with Policy 1.5.3(a) or where a site-specific exception has been established in accordance with Section 2.7, the maximum allowable residential density within each compatibility zone is as indicated below and shown in **Table 2A**:

Compatibility Zone	A	B1	B2	C1	C2	D
	Dwelling Units per Acre					
Maximum Sitewide Average Density	0	0*	0*	0*	15.0	No Limit
Maximum Single-Acre Density	0	0	0	0	30.0	No Limit
* Portions of a project site may extend into these zones provided that no dwelling is located there						

- (1) For projects that are solely residential, the “sitewide average” density equals the total number of dwelling units divided by the site size in acres (i.e., the gross acreage of the project site) which may include multiple parcels.
- (2) The “single-acre” density equals the number of dwelling units in any single acre.
- (3) See Section 2.1.3 with regard to mixed residential and nonresidential development.
- (4) See Section 2.1.4 with regard to parcels lying within multiple compatibility zones.

- (b) Density bonuses and other bonuses or allowances that local agencies may provide for affordable housing developed in accordance with the provisions of state and/or local law or regulation shall be included when calculating residential densities. The overall density of a development project, including any bonuses or allowances, must comply with the allowable density criteria.
- (c) Secondary units, as defined by state law and local regulations, shall be excluded from density calculations.
- (d) In accordance with state law, a family day care home serving 14 or fewer children may be established in any existing dwelling or in any new dwelling permitted by the policies of this *Compatibility Plan*.

2.3.2. *Nonresidential Development Intensity Criteria:* Nonresidential development shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

- (a) The usage intensity (people per acre) limit indicated in **Table 2A** for each compatibility zone is the fundamental criterion against which the safety compatibility of most nonresidential land uses shall be measured. Other criteria may be applicable to uses of special concern (see Section 2.3.6).
- (b) All nonresidential uses, including uses listed in **Table 2A**, *Basic Compatibility Criteria*, as “Normally Compatible,” must comply with both the “sitewide average” and “single-acre” usage intensity limits indicated below and shown in **Table 2A** for each compatibility zone.

Compatibility Zone	A	B1	B2	C1	C2	D
	People per Acre					
Maximum Sitewide Average Intensity	10	80	150	150	No Limit	No Limit
Maximum Single-Acre Intensity	20	160	450	450	No Limit	No Limit

- (1) The “sitewide average” intensity equals the total number of people expected to be on the entire site divided by the site size in acres (i.e., the gross acreage of the project site) which may include multiple parcels.

- (2) The “single-acre” intensity equals the number of people expected to occupy the most intensively used 1.0-acre area(s) of the site.
  - (3) Site-specific exceptions to the criteria in this paragraph are provided in Section 2.7.
- (c) No new structures intended to be occupied regularly are allowed in Compatibility Zone A.
- (d) The need to calculate the usage intensity of a particular project proposal for compliance with the intensity criteria in the Paragraph (b) table is to be governed by the following:
- (1) Land use categories indicated in **Table 2A** as “Normally Compatible” for a particular compatibility zone are presumed to meet the intensity criteria indicated in the Paragraph (b) table. Calculation of the usage intensity is not required unless the particular project proposal represents an atypical example of the usage type.
  - (2) Calculation of the usage intensity must be done for all proposed projects where the land use category for the particular compatibility zone is indicated in **Table 2A** as “Conditional” and the additional criteria column says “Ensure intensity criteria met.”
  - (3) Where **Table 2A** indicates that land use category is “Conditional” for the particular safety zone, but the criteria are other than “Ensure intensity criteria met,” calculation of the usage intensity is not necessary for typical examples of the use. However, the project proposal must comply with the other criteria listed for the applicable land use category and compatibility zone.
- (e) Usage intensity calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outdoors. For the purposes of these calculations, the total number of occupants during normal busiest periods shall be used.<sup>18</sup>
- (f) Each component use within a nonresidential development that has multiple types of uses shall comply with the usage intensity criteria in Paragraph (b) above and in **Table 2A**, *Basic Compatibility Criteria*, unless the use is ancillary to the primary use. Ancillary uses must be considered in the sitewide average intensity limits, but may be excluded from the single-acre intensity calculations.
- (1) To qualify as an ancillary use, the use must be associated with the primary use (e.g. a cafeteria in an office building) and occupy no more than 10% of total building floor area.
  - (2) An ancillary use may be more intensively occupied (more people in a given area) than the primary use, provided that the ancillary use is neither:
    - An assembly room having more than 750 square feet of floor area (this criterion is intended to parallel building code standards) and a capacity of 50 people; nor
    - A K-12 school, day care center (greater than 14 children), or other risk-sensitive use that is “incompatible” within the safety zone where the primary use is to be located.

---

<sup>18</sup> This number will typically be lower than the absolute maximum number of occupants the facility can accommodate (such as would be used in determining compliance with building and fire codes).

- 2.3.3. *Methodology for Calculation of Sitenide Average Intensity*: Determination of compliance with the sitewide average intensity criteria indicated in Section 2.3.2(b) requires calculating the total occupancy of the site at any given time under normal busy use (see Section 2.3.2(e)), then dividing by the total (gross) acreage of the project site (see **Figure 2**).
- (a) Calculation of Total Occupancy: Determination of total occupancy shall consider the following factors (additional guidance is found in **Appendix C** of the *Review Procedures* document):
- (1) Fixed Seating: For uses having fixed seating for customers (for example, restaurants and theaters), occupancy shall equal the total number of seats plus the number of employees on site.
  - (2) Occupancy Load Factors: For most other uses, the Occupancy Load Factor indicated in **Table 2A** for the use shall be applied.<sup>19</sup> The Occupancy Load Factor is the assumed approximate number of square feet occupied by each person in that use. Dividing the square footage of the building or component use by the Occupancy Load Factor for the use yields the number of occupants.
    - For projects involving a mixture of uses in a building, the Occupancy Load Factor for each component use shall be applied to give the occupancy for that use, then the component occupancies added to determine total occupancy.
    - If the project applicant can document a higher or lower Occupancy Load Factor for a particular use, then the reviewing agency may use that number in lieu of the number in **Table 2A**. In considering any such exceptions, the reviewing agency shall also take into account the potential for the use of a building to change over time (see Section 2.3.5).
  - (3) Vehicle Parking Requirements: For many commercial and industrial uses, the occupancy can be estimated by considering the number of parking spaces required by the local agency and multiplying by the average occupancy per vehicle. This method is not suitable for land uses where many users arrive on foot or by transit, bicycle, or other means of transportation.
  - (4) Building and Fire Codes: This method is essentially the same as the Occupancy Load Factor method in that the codes provide a square footage per person for various types of building uses. Building and Fire Codes, though, are based on a maximum, never to be exceeded, number of occupants rather than the average busy period that is the basis for airport land use compatibility planning. As such, the total occupancy calculated using these codes must be reduced by a set factor—one half for most uses—to provide a number consistent with the intensity limits listed in Section 2.3.2(b).

---

<sup>19</sup> Occupancy Load Factors are based on information from various sources and are intended to represent busy-period usage for typical examples of the land use category. They can be used as a factor in determining the appropriate land use category for unlisted uses or atypical examples of a use.

**Figure 2: Intensity Calculation Example**

In this example, both the sitewide and single-acre Intensity of a proposed warehouse facility is calculated using the common Occupancy Load Factors [number of square feet per person] information in Table 2A, *Basic Compatibility Criteria* together with project specifications. The results are then compared with the maximum sitewide and single-acre Intensity limits in Table 2A to determine consistency of the project with the safety criteria.



**Safety Criteria Data**

**Compatibility Zone C1 Intensity Limits**

Max. Sitewide Average: 150 people per acre  
 Max. Single-Acre: 450 people per acre

**Common Occupancy Load Factors**

Office: approx. 215 s.f. per person  
 Light Industrial, Low Intensity: approx. 350 s.f. per person  
 Warehouse: approx. 1,000 s.f. per person

**Project Data**

Site Acreage: 3 acres  
 Office: 19,560 s.f.  
 Light Industrial: 24,000 s.f.  
 Warehouse: 65,000 s.f.

**Occupancy Load Calculation**

Office:  $\frac{19,560 \text{ s.f.}}{215 \text{ s.f. per person}} = 91 \text{ people}$   
 L-industrial:  $\frac{24,000 \text{ s.f.}}{350 \text{ s.f. per person}} = 69 \text{ people}$   
 Warehouse:  $\frac{65,000 \text{ s.f.}}{1,000 \text{ s.f. per person}} = 65 \text{ people}$

**Intensity Results**

The results of the intensity calculations indicate that the proposed development satisfies the sitewide and single-acre intensity criteria.

**Sitewide Average Intensity**

$\frac{\text{Total people}}{\text{Site Acreage}} = \frac{225 \text{ people}}{3 \text{ acres}} = 75 \text{ people per acre}$

**Single-Acre Intensity**


$\frac{\text{Total people}}{\text{Single-Acre}} = \frac{91 + 69 \text{ people}}{1 \text{ acre}} = 160 \text{ people per acre}$

- (b) Floor Area Ratio Methodology: As an alternative to determining compliance with usage intensity criteria through calculation of total occupancy as indicated in Paragraph subsection (a) of this policy, the reviewing agency may use the proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of a project as the test for compliance.<sup>20</sup>
- (1) The maximum acceptable FAR for most nonresidential land use categories is listed in **Table 2A** for compatibility zones where the acceptability of the use is “Conditional.” For single-use projects, compliance with the usage intensity limits in Section 2.3.2(b) may be tested by directly comparing the FAR of the proposed project with the FAR limit shown in the table. See Paragraph (c) below for projects involving multiple nonresidential uses.
  - (2) FARs are not shown for uses that are “Normally Compatible” within a particular zone as these uses are presumed to be capable of meeting the usage intensity limits. FARs are also not listed for uses that are “Incompatible” within a specific zone because these uses either are typically incapable of meeting the usage intensity limits or are incompatible for other reasons.
  - (3) The limit listed for each use directly corresponds with the maximum acceptable usage intensity for the zone and the indicated typical Occupancy Load Factor (floor area square footage per person) for the use. The allowable FAR in a particular compatibility zone thus varies from one land use category to another.
  - (4) If a higher or lower Occupancy Load Factor can be documented for a particular project (see Paragraph 0 of this policy), then the allowable FAR would be correspondingly lower or higher, but in all cases the basic usage intensity criterion must be met.
- (c) Projects with Multiple Nonresidential Uses: For projects involving multiple nonresidential land use categories (e.g., office and retail), the occupancy for each component use must be calculated separately and then added to produce the total occupancy.
- (1) If the FAR methodology is used, then each component use must be assigned a share of the overall project site. Typically, this share shall be assumed to be the same as the component use’s share of the total project floor area.
  - (2) For criteria pertaining to mixed-use projects having both residential and nonresidential components, see Section 2.1.3.

---

<sup>20</sup> Floor Area Ratio equals the total floor area of a project in square feet divided by the square footage of the site. For multi-floor buildings the square footage of each floor is counted.

- (d) Projects Within Multiple Compatibility Zones: If a project site lies within multiple compatibility zones, the site shall be considered as if it is multiple parcels divided at the zone boundary line (see **Figure 3**).



2.3.4. *Methodology for Calculation of Single-Acre Intensity:* The single-acre intensity of a proposed development shall be calculated by determining the total number of people expected to be within any 1.0-acre portion of the site, typically the most intensively used building or part of a building. Calculation of the single-acre intensity depends upon the building footprint and site sizes and the distribution of activities on the site.

- For sites less than 1.0 acre, the single-acre intensity equals the total number of people on the site divided by the site size in acres.
- For sites more than 1.0 acre and a building footprint less than 1.0 acre, the single-acre intensity equals the total number of building occupants unless the project includes substantial outdoor occupancy in which case such usage should be taken into account.
- For sites having both site size and building footprint of more than 1.0 acre, the single-acre intensity shall normally be calculated as the total number of building occupants divided by the building footprint in acres. This calculation assumes that the occupancy of the building is evenly distributed. However, if the occupancy of the building is concentrated in one area—the office area of a large warehouse, for example—then all occupants of that area shall be included in the single-acre calculation.
- The 1.0-acre areas to be evaluated shall normally match the building footprints provided that the buildings are generally rectangular (reasonably close to square) and not elongated in shape and, for buildings larger than 1.0 acre, may represent a portion of the building.

- (e) If a building has multiple floors, then the total number of occupants on all floors falling within the 1.0-acre footprint shall be counted.
- 2.3.5. *Long-Term Changes in Occupancy:* In evaluating compliance of a proposed nonresidential development with the usage intensity criteria in Section 2.3.2(b), the reviewing agency shall take into account the potential for the use of a building to change over time. A building could have planned low-intensity use initially, but later be converted to a higher-intensity use. Local agencies must establish permit language or other mechanisms to ensure continued compliance with the usage intensity criteria. (Note that this provision applies only to new development and redevelopment—projects for which discretionary local agency action is required—not to tenant improvements or other changes to existing buildings for which local approval is ministerial.)
- 2.3.6. *Land Uses of Special Concern:* Certain types of land uses represent special safety concerns irrespective of the number of people associated with those uses. Land uses of particular concern and the nature of the concern are listed below along with the criteria applicable to these uses. In some cases, these uses are not allowed in portions of the airport environs regardless of the number of occupants associated with the use. In other instances these uses should be avoided—that is, allowed only if an alternative site outside the zone would not serve the intended function. When the use is allowed, special measures should be taken to minimize hazards to the facility and occupants if the facility were to be struck by an aircraft.
- (a) *Uses Having Vulnerable Occupants:* These uses are ones in which the majority of occupants are children, elderly, and/or disabled—people who have reduced effective mobility or may be unable to respond to emergency situations.
- (1) The primary uses in this category are:
    - Children’s schools (grades K–12).
    - Day care centers (facilities with more than 14 children, as defined in the California Health and Safety Code).
    - In-patient hospitals, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and similar facilities where patients remain overnight.
    - Congregate care facilities including retirement homes, assisted living, and intermediate care facilities.
    - Penal institutions.
  - (2) Criteria for new or expanded facilities of these types are as follows:
    - In Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1, and C2, all of the above uses are incompatible, and therefore, no new sites, or facilities, or expansion of existing sites or facilities, shall be allowed.
    - In Compatibility Zone D children’s schools are incompatible, and therefore, no new sites or facilities or expansion of existing sites or facilities shall be allowed; however, a one-time capacity expansion of not more than 50 students to an existing school would be allowed.
    - All of the above uses are compatible in Compatibility Zone E.
- (b) *Hazardous Materials Storage:* Materials that are flammable, explosive, corrosive, or toxic constitute special safety compatibility concerns to the extent that an aircraft accident could cause release of the materials and thereby pose dangers to people and property in the vicinity.
- (1) Facilities in this category include:

- Facilities such as oil refineries and chemical plants that manufacture, process, and/or store bulk quantities of hazardous materials generally for shipment elsewhere.
  - Facilities associated with otherwise compatible land uses where hazardous materials are stored in smaller quantities primarily for on-site use.
- (2) Criteria for new or expanded facilities of these types are as follows:
- Facilities in the first group are incompatible in Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1, and C2. No new sites or facilities or expansion of existing sites or facilities shall be allowed. New sites or construction of new expanded facilities shall be allowed in Compatibility Zones D and E only if an alternative site outside of the airport influence area would not serve the intended function of the facility.
  - Facilities in the second group are incompatible in Compatibility Zone A. No new sites or facilities or expansion of existing sites or facilities shall be allowed. Bulk storage of hazardous materials shall not be allowed in Compatibility Zones B1, B2, and C1. In Compatibility Zones C2, and D, bulk storage of hazardous materials should be avoided, but storage of smaller amounts for near-term on-site use is acceptable. Permitting agencies should evaluate the need for special measures to minimize hazards if the facility should be struck by an aircraft. These uses are compatible in Compatibility Zone E.
- (c) Critical Community Infrastructure: This category pertains to facilities where damage or destruction of the facility would cause significant adverse effects to public health and welfare well beyond the immediate vicinity of the facility.
- (1) Among these facilities are:
- Public safety facilities such as police and fire stations.
  - Communications facilities including emergency communications, broadcast, and cell phone towers.
  - Primary, peaker (power plants that generally run only when there is a high demand), and renewable energy power plants, electrical substations, and other utilities.
- (2) Criteria for new or expanded facilities of these types are as follows:
- Public safety facilities are incompatible in Compatibility Zones A and B1. No new sites or facilities or expansion of existing sites or facilities shall be allowed. In Compatibility Zone B2, public safety facilities shall be allowed only if the facility serves or has an airport-related function. In Compatibility Zones C1 and C2, creation or expansion of these types of facilities shall be allowed only if an alternative site outside of these zones would not serve the intended function of the facility.
  - Communications facilities are incompatible in Compatibility Zones A, B1, and B2. No new sites or facilities or expansion of existing sites or facilities shall be allowed. In Compatibility Zones C1, C2, and D, creation or expansion of these types of facilities shall be allowed only if an alternative site outside of these zones would not serve the intended function of the facility and the height of the facility complies with airspace protection criteria set forth in Section 2.4 of this *Compatibility Plan*. Communications facilities are compatible in Compatibility Zone E.
  - Primary power plants are incompatible in the entire airport influence area except that they may be allowed in Compatibility Zone D or E if an alternative

site outside of these zones would not serve the intended function of the facility. Peaker and renewable energy power plants are incompatible in Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1, and C2. No new sites or facilities or expansion of existing sites or facilities shall be allowed. Any facility to be located in Compatibility Zone D or E must comply with the height limit, electrical interference, glare, visible and thermal plume, and other criteria contained in the airspace protection section, Section 2.4, of this *Compatibility Plan*.

## 2.4. Airspace Protection Compatibility Policies

### AIRSPACE PROTECTION COMPATIBILITY POLICIES BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Airspace Protection Compatibility Policies Background Information in this box has been considered in formulating the Airspace Protection Compatibility policies in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only and does not itself constitute *Compatibility Plan* policy.

#### **Policy Objective**

Airspace protection compatibility policies seek to prevent creation of land use features that can pose hazards to the airspace required by aircraft in flight and have the potential for causing an aircraft accident.

#### **Measures of Hazards to Airspace**

Three categories of hazards to airspace are a concern: physical, visual, and electronic.

- *Physical hazards* include tall structures that have the potential to intrude upon protected airspace as well as land use features that have the potential to attract birds or other potentially hazardous wildlife to the airport area.
- *Visual hazards* include certain types of lights, sources of glare, and sources of dust, steam, or smoke.
- *Electronic hazards* are ones that may cause interference with aircraft communications or navigation.

#### **Factors Considered in Setting Airspace Protection / Object Height Compatibility Policies**

The *Compatibility Plan* airspace protection policies rely upon the regulations and standards enacted by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the State of California. The FAA has well defined standards by which potential hazards to flight, especially airspace obstructions, can be assessed. The following FAA regulations and documents, and any later versions of these documents, are specifically relevant.

- Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, *Safe, Efficient Use and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace* (provides standards regarding FAA notification of proposed objects and height limits of objects near airports).
- FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, *Airport Design* (provides standards regarding safety-related areas in the immediate vicinity of runways).
- Advisory Circular 70/7460-1K, *Obstruction Marking and Lighting* (sets standards for how essential marking and lighting should be designed).

These regulations and standards do not give the FAA authority to prevent the creation of hazards to flight. That authority rests with state and local government. The State of California has enacted regulations enabling state and *Local Agencies* to enforce the FAA standards. The *Compatibility Plan* policies are intended to help implement the federal and state regulations.

#### **Factors Considered in Setting Airspace Protection / Wildlife Hazard Compatibility Policies**

Natural features and agricultural practices may include open water and food sources that are attractive to wildlife, especially waterfowl and other bird species. The *Compatibility Plan* relies upon the wildlife hazard guidelines established by the FAA in the following Advisory Circulars:

- FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, *Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports* (provides

guidance on types of attractants to be avoided).

- FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-34A, *Construction or Establishment of Landfills near Public Airports* (sets guidelines on proximity of these facilities to airports).

2.4.1. *Evaluating Airspace Protection / Object Height Compatibility for New Development:* The object height compatibility of proposed land uses within the influence area of Brackett Field Airport shall be evaluated in accordance with the policies in this section, including the airspace protection surfaces depicted on **Map 2B**, *Airspace Protection Surfaces*.

- (a) The airspace protection / height limit surfaces are drawn in accordance with FAR Part 77, Subpart C, and reflect the runway length, runway end locations, and approach type for each end of the runway.
- (b) The Critical Airspace Protection Zone consists of the FAR Part 77 primary surface and the area beneath portions of the approach and transitional surfaces to where these surfaces intersect with the horizontal surface together with the High Terrain Area.
- (c) The High Terrain Area encompasses locations where the ground elevation exceeds or is within 35 feet beneath an Airspace Protection Surface as defined by FAR Part 77 for the airport.

2.4.2. *Object Height Criteria:* The criteria for determining the acceptability of a project with respect to height shall be based upon the standards set forth in FAR Part 77, Subpart C, *Safe, Efficient Use and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace*, and applicable airport design standards published by the FAA. Additionally, where an FAA aeronautical study of a proposed object has been required as described in Section 2.4.4, the results of that study shall be taken into account by the reviewing agency.

- (a) Except as provided in Paragraphs (b) and (c) of this policy, no object, including a mobile object such as a vehicle or temporary object such as construction crane, shall have a height that would result in penetration of an airspace protection surface depicted for Brackett Field Airport on **Map 2B**. Any object that penetrates one of these surfaces is, by FAA definition, deemed an obstruction.<sup>21</sup>
- (b) Objects not situated within a Critical Airspace Protection Zone (see Section 2.4.1(b)) may be allowed to have heights that penetrate the Airspace Protection Surfaces defined by FAR Part 77 criteria.
  - (1) The maximum allowable height for these objects is 35 feet above ground level.
  - (2) The height of all objects is subject to local agency zoning limits.
- (c) A proposed object having a height that exceeds any of the airport's Airspace Protection Surfaces shall be allowed only if *all* of the following apply:
  - (1) As the result of an aeronautical study, the FAA determines that the object would not be a hazard to air navigation.
  - (2) FAA or other expert analysis conducted under the auspices of the ALUC or the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works as airport operator con-

<sup>21</sup> An obstruction may or may not be a hazard. The purpose of FAA aeronautical studies is to determine whether an obstruction is a hazard and, if so, what remedy is recommended. The FAA's remedies are limited to making changes to the airspace and an airport's approach procedures, but it also can indicate an objection to proposed structures that it deems to be a hazard.

cludes that, despite being an airspace obstruction (not necessarily a hazard), the object that would not cause any of the following:

- An increase in the ceiling or visibility minimums of the airport for an existing or planned instrument procedure (a planned procedure is one that is formally on file with the FAA);
  - A reduction of the established operational efficiency and capacity of the airport, such as by causing the usable length of the runway to be reduced; or
  - Conflict with the visual flight rules (VFR) airspace used for the airport traffic pattern or en route navigation to and from the airport.
- (3) Marking and lighting of the object will be installed as directed by the FAA aeronautical study or the California Division of Aeronautics and in a manner consistent with FAA standards in effect at the time the construction is proposed.<sup>22</sup>
  - (4) An aviation easement is dedicated to the County of Los Angeles in accordance with Section 2.6.1.
  - (5) The proposed project/plan complies with all other policies of this *Compatibility Plan*.

2.4.3. *Criteria Addressing Other Flight Hazards:* Land uses that may cause visual, electronic, or wildlife hazards, particularly bird strike hazards, to aircraft in flight or taking off or landing at the airport shall not be allowed within the airport influence area unless the uses are consistent with FAA rules and regulations.

(a) Specific characteristics to be avoided include:

- (1) Sources of glare (such as from mirrored or other highly reflective structures or building features) or bright lights (including search lights and laser light displays);
- (2) Distracting lights that could be mistaken for airport lights;
- (3) Sources of dust, steam, or smoke that may impair pilots' vision;
- (4) Sources of steam or other emissions that cause thermal plumes or other forms of unstable air;
- (5) Sources of electrical interference with aircraft communications or navigation; and
- (6) Any proposed use that creates an increased attraction for wildlife and that is inconsistent with FAA rules and regulations.<sup>23</sup> Of particular concern are landfills and certain recreational or agricultural uses that attract large flocks of birds which pose bird strike hazards to aircraft in flight.

(b) To resolve any uncertainties with regard to the significance of the above types of flight hazards, the reviewing agency should consult with FAA officials, the California Division of Aeronautics, and the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

<sup>22</sup> Advisory Circular 70/7460-1J, *Obstruction Marking and Lighting*, or any later FAA guidance.

<sup>23</sup> The FAA rules and regulations include, but are not limited to: Public Law 106-181 (Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, known as AIR 21), Section 503; 40 CFR 258, *Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills*, Section 258.10, Airport Safety; Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, *Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports*; Advisory Circular 150/5200-34A, *Construction or Establishment of Landfills near Public Airports*; and any subsequent applicable FAA guidance.

- 2.4.4. *Requirements for FAA Notification of Proposed Construction:* Project proponents are responsible for notifying the FAA about proposed construction that may affect navigable airspace.<sup>24</sup> The following is ALUC policy on this topic.
- (a) Reference to FAA notification requirements is included here for informational purposes only, not as a *Compatibility Plan* policy.
  - (b) The local agency having jurisdiction over the project site should inform the project proponent of the requirements for notification to the FAA.
  - (c) Any proposed development project that includes construction of a structure or other object and that is required to be referred to the ALUC for a consistency review in accordance with Sections 1.4.1 or 1.4.2 shall include a copy of the completed FAR Part 77 notification form (Form 7460-1) submitted to the FAA, if applicable, and of the resulting FAA findings from its aeronautical study (i.e., notice of determination letter). A proposed project may be referred to the ALUC in advance of the completion of the FAA aeronautical study. However, the completed aeronautical study must be forwarded to the ALUC when available and the ALUC may reconsider its previous consistency determination if the FAA study provides new information and airspace protection was a factor in the ALUC's determination. The ALUC encourages local agencies to follow a similar process once they become the project reviewing agency.

## 2.5. Overflight Compatibility Policies

### OVERFLIGHT COMPATIBILITY POLICIES BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Overflight Compatibility Policies Background Information in this box has been considered in formulating the Overflight Compatibility policies in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only and does not itself constitute *Compatibility Plan* policy.

#### **Policy Objective**

Noise from individual aircraft operations, especially by comparatively loud aircraft, can be intrusive and annoying in locations beyond the limits of the noise exposure areas addressed by the policies in Section 2.2. Sensitivity to aircraft overflight varies from one person to another.

#### **Measures of Overflight Exposure**

<sup>24</sup> FAR Part 77 requires that a project proponent submit notification of a proposal to the FAA where required by the provisions of FAR Part 77, Subpart B. California Public Utilities Code Sections 21658 and 21659 likewise include this requirement. FAA notification requirements apply to all objects including structures, antennas, trees, mobile objects, and temporary objects such as construction cranes. The FAA will conduct an "aeronautical study" of the object(s) and determine whether the object(s) would be of a height that would constitute a hazard to air navigation. (See **Appendix B** of the *Review Procedures* document for a copy of FAR Part 77 and online procedures for filing Form 7460-1.) FAA notification is required under the following circumstances:

- (a) The project contains proposed structures or other objects that exceed the height standards defined in FAR Part 77, Subpart B. Objects shielded by nearby taller objects are exempted in accordance with FAR Part 77, Paragraph 77.15. Note that notification to the FAA under FAR Part 77, Subpart B, is required even for certain proposed construction that does not exceed the height limits allowed by Subpart C of the regulations. Also, the FAA notification area extends beyond the Airport Influence Area depicted on **Map 2A, Compatibility Map**. For Brackett Field, the Subpart B notification airspace surface extends outward and upward at a slope of 100 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 20,000 feet from the nearest point on any runway.
- (b) Any proposal for construction or alteration of a structure, including antennas, taller than 200 feet above the ground level at the site regardless of proximity to any airport.

The loudness and frequency of occurrence of individual aircraft noise events are key determinants of where airport proximity and aircraft overflight notification is warranted. Single-event noise levels are especially important in areas that are overflown regularly by aircraft, but that do not have a significant CNEL.

Locations where aircraft regularly fly at approximately the traffic pattern altitude—1,000 feet above ground level—or lower are considered to be within the overflight impact area of Brackett Field Airport. Note that the flight altitude above ground level will be more or less than this amount depending upon the terrain below. Areas of high terrain beneath the traffic patterns are exposed to comparatively greater noise levels, a factor that is considered in the overflight policies.

### **Factors Considered in Setting Overflight Compatibility Policies**

Factors considered in establishing overflight compatibility policies include the following:

- Unlike the function of the noise, safety, and airspace protection compatibility policies in this *Compatibility Plan*, overflight compatibility policies do not restrict the manner in which land can be developed or used. The policies serve only to establish the form and requirements for notification about airport proximity and aircraft overflights to be given in conjunction with local agency approval of new development and with certain real estate transactions involving existing development.
- To be most effective, overflight policies should establish notification requirements for transactions involving existing residential land uses, not just future residential development. However, the only function of the *Compatibility Plan* with regard to existing land uses is to define the boundaries within which airport proximity disclosure in conjunction with real estate transactions should be provided as specified under state law. Other than setting the disclosure boundary, the policies in this section apply only to new residential development.
- State airport proximity disclosure law applies to existing development, but not to all transactions. [California state statutes (*Business and Professional Code Section 11010* and *Civil Code Sections 1102.6, 1103.4, and 1353*) require that, as part of many residential real estate transactions, information be disclosed regarding whether the property is situated within an airport influence area. These state requirements apply to the sale or lease of newly subdivided lands and condominium conversions and to the sale of certain existing residential property. In general, airport proximity disclosure is required with existing residential property transfer only when certain natural conditions (earthquake, fire, or flood hazards) warrant disclosure.]
- Need for continuity of notification to future property owners and tenants. To the extent that this *Compatibility Plan* sets notification requirements for new development, notifications should be in a form that runs with the land and is provided to prospective future owners and tenants.
- To avoid inappropriateness of avigation easement dedication solely for buyer awareness purposes. Avigation easements involve conveyance of property rights from the property owner to the party owning the easement and are thus best suited to locations where land use restrictions for noise, safety, or airspace protection purposes are necessary. Property rights conveyance is not needed for buyer awareness purposes.

2.5.1. *Recorded Overflight Notification:* As a condition for local agency approval of residential land use development (excluding future single-family dwellings on legal lots of record) within Compatibility Zones D and E as defined by **Map 2A**, an overflight notification shall be recorded in the chain of title of the property. A recorded overflight notification is not required in Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1 or C2 as the avigation easement dedication requirement within those zones accomplishes the notification function.

- (a) The notification shall be of a format similar to that indicated in **Appendix E** of the *Review Procedures* document and shall contain the following language dictated by state law with regard to airport proximity disclosure in conjunction with real estate transfer:

NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY: This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For

that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

- (b) The notification shall be evident to prospective purchaser(s) of the property and shall appear on the property deed.
- (c) A recorded overflight notification is not required where an aviation easement is provided (i.e., within portions of Compatibility Zones D and E that also fall within the Critical Airspace Protection Zone).
- (d) Recording of an overflight notification is not required for nonresidential development.

2.5.2. *Airport Proximity Disclosure*: State law requires that notice disclosing information about the presence of a nearby airport be given to prospective buyers of certain residential real estate within an airport influence area. The statutes define an airport influence area as “the area in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses as determined by an airport land use commission.”<sup>25</sup> *Compatibility Plan* criteria with regard to airport proximity disclosure is as follows:

- (a) For existing residences:
  - (1) Airport proximity disclosure as part of real estate transactions involving existing residences is a matter between private parties. Neither the ALUC nor local agencies have authority to mandate that airport proximity disclosure be provided nor do neither the ALUC nor local agencies have enforcement responsibilities with regard to this disclosure.
  - (2) The sole responsibility of the ALUC with regard to airport proximity disclosure for existing residences is to recommend the boundary of the area within which the disclosure is deemed appropriate and to make this information available to local title companies and real estate agents. The recommended airport proximity disclosure for Brackett Field Airport is identified on **Map 2A** in this chapter and includes the entire airport influence area.
  - (3) The ALUC recommends that airport proximity disclosure be provided as part of *all* real estate transactions (sale, lease, or rental) involving existing residential property anywhere within the airport influence area.
- (b) For proposed residential development:
  - (1) The disclosure provisions of state law are deemed mandatory for new residential development anywhere within the airport influence area and shall continue in effect as *Compatibility Plan* criteria even if the state law is made less stringent or rescinded. The disclosure shall be of a format similar to that indicated in **Appendix E** of the *Review Procedures* document and shall contain the language dictated by state law (see Section 2.5.1(a)).
  - (2) Signs providing the notice included in Section 2.5.1(a) and a map of the airport influence area shall be prominently posted in the real estate sales office and/or

<sup>25</sup> See California Business and Professions Code Section 11010(b) and Civil Code Section 1353(a).

other key locations at any new residential development within the airport influence area.

## 2.6. Policies for Special Circumstances

2.6.1. *Avigation Easement Dedication*: As a condition for local agency approval of projects that meet the conditions in Paragraphs (a) of this policy, the property owner shall be required to dedicate an avigation easement to the County of Los Angeles.

(a) Avigation easement dedication shall be required for any proposed off-airport development located completely or partially within Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1, C2 or within the Critical Airspace Protection Zone as shown on **Map 2B**, *Airspace Protection Map* of this policy, including infill development, for which discretionary local agency approval is required. Except that:

- (1) Avigation easement dedication is not required for ministerial approvals such as building permits or actions associated with modification of existing single-family residences.
- (2) Unless previously required prior to the adoption date of this *Compatibility Plan*, the requirement to dedicate an avigation easement shall not be applicable to existing land uses located within the area where dedication is required for new land use projects.

(b) The avigation easement shall:

- (1) Provide the right of flight in the airspace above the property;
- (2) Allow the generation of noise and other impacts associated with aircraft overflight;
- (3) Restrict the height of structures, trees and other objects in accordance with the policies in Section 2.4 and **Map 2B**, *Airspace Protection Map*;
- (4) Permit access to the property for the removal or aeronautical marking of objects exceeding the established height limit; and
- (5) Prohibit electrical interference, glare, and other potential hazards to flight from being created on the property.

(c) An example of an avigation easement is provided in **Appendix E** of the *Review Procedures* document.

2.6.2. *Infill*: Where land uses not in conformance with the criteria set forth in this *Compatibility Plan* exist at the time of the plan's adoption, infill development of similar land uses may be allowed to occur in that area even if the proposed land use is otherwise incompatible with respect to the compatibility criteria for that location.

- (a) *Review Procedures* Section 3.3.1 establishes the conditions that a project site must meet to qualify as infill and the increased residential density or nonresidential intensity allowed above the levels specified in the policies of individual compatibility plans.
- (b) Alternatively, for the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan*, a project site may also qualify as infill if it is part of a cohesive area, defined by the local agency and accepted by the ALUC Administrative Officer, within which at least 65% of the uses were existing prior to the *Compatibility Plan* adoption with uses not in conformance with the plan. Qual-

ifying sites shall be allowed to have increased densities and/or intensities up to the limits set by *Review Procedures* Sections 3.3.1(c) and 3.3.1(d).

- (c) Regardless of which qualifying test is used, the burden for demonstrating that an area or an individual site qualifies as infill rests with the affected land use agency and/or project proponent and is not the responsibility of the ALUC. However, the ALUC Administrative Officer must verify that a site qualifies as infill before increased density and/or intensity shall be allowed.

2.6.3. *Existing Nonconforming Uses*: Proposed changes to existing land uses (including a parcel or building) that are not in conformance with the criteria in this *Compatibility Plan* shall be limited as follows:

- (a) Residential uses.

- (1) A nonconforming residential land use may be continued, sold, leased, or rented without restriction or airport land use compatibility review.
- (2) A nonconforming single-family dwelling may be maintained, remodeled, reconstructed (see Section 2.6.4), or expanded in size. The lot line of an existing single-family residential parcel may be adjusted. Also, a new single-family residence may be constructed on an existing lot in accordance with Section 1.5.3. However:
  - Any remodeling, reconstruction, or expansion must not increase the number of dwelling units. For example, a bedroom could be added to an existing residence, but an additional dwelling unit could not be built on the parcel unless that unit is a secondary dwelling unit as defined by state law and local regulations.
  - Any increase in height must comply with the policies in Section 2.4 (Airspace Protection Compatibility Policies).
  - A single-family residential parcel may not be divided for the purpose of allowing additional dwellings to be constructed.
- (3) Nonconforming multi-family residential dwellings may be maintained, remodeled, or reconstructed (see Section **Error! Reference source not found.**). The size of individual dwelling units may be increased, but additional dwelling units may not be added.
- (4) The sound attenuation and avigation easement dedication requirements set by Sections 2.2.2 and 2.6.1 shall apply.

- (b) Nonresidential uses (other than land uses of special concern enumerated at Section 2.3.6):

- (1) A nonconforming nonresidential use may be continued, sold, leased, or rented without restriction or airport land use compatibility review provided that no discretionary local agency approval (such as a conditional use permit) is required.
- (2) Nonconforming nonresidential facilities may be maintained, altered, or, reconstructed (see Section 2.6.4). However, any such work:
  - Must not result in expansion of either the portion of the site devoted to the nonconforming use or the floor area of the buildings; and
  - Must not result in an increase in the usage intensity (people per acre) above the levels existing at the time of adoption of this *Compatibility Plan*.
  - Must not increase the storage or use of hazardous materials.

- (3) The sound attenuation and avigation easement dedication requirements set by Sections 2.2.2 and 2.6.1 shall apply.
- 2.6.4. *Reconstruction*: An existing nonconforming development that has been fully or partially destroyed as the result of a calamity may be rebuilt only under the following conditions:
- (a) Nonconforming residential uses may be rebuilt provided that the expansion does not result in more dwelling units than existed on the parcel at the time of the damage. For the purposes of this Compatibility Plan, residential reconstruction may include the addition of a secondary dwelling unit to a single-family residence where permitted by state law and local regulations.
  - (b) A nonconforming nonresidential development may be rebuilt provided that it has been only partially destroyed and that the reconstruction does not increase the floor area of the previous structure or result in an increased intensity of use (i.e., more people per acre). Partial destruction shall be considered to mean damage that can be repaired at a cost of no more than 75% of the assessor's full cash value of the structure at the time of the damage. Any nonresidential use that has been more than 75% destroyed must comply with all applicable standards herein when reconstructed.
  - (c) Reconstruction under Sub-Policies (a) or (b) above must begin within 24 months of the date the damage occurred.
  - (d) The above exceptions do not apply within a runway protection zone or clear zone or where such reconstruction would be in conflict with the general plan or zoning ordinance of Los Angeles County or affected city.
  - (e) Nothing in the above policies is intended to preclude work required for normal maintenance and repair.

## 2.7. Site-Specific Exceptions

- 2.7.1. *General*: In adoption of this *Compatibility Plan*, the ALUC has determined that certain projects warrant special conditions treatment as envisioned by *Review Procedures* Section 3.3.7 and Section 2.1.5 of this *Compatibility Plan*. These site-specific exceptions and the criteria to be applied to them are as described in the following policies of this section.
- 2.7.2. *Old Town La Verne (including La Verne Section of Fairplex)*: In March 2013, the City of La Verne adopted a specific plan for the area in the southeastern portion of the city known as Old Town La Verne. The southern edge of the area encompasses approximately 18.8 acres (excluding rail right-of-way), 14.6 acres of which are within the north end of the Los Angeles County Fairplex. The site is adjacent to two commuter rail stations. The specific plan proposes redevelopment of this area from low-intensity nonresidential uses (mostly auto parking and mini-storage) to high-intensity, transit-oriented commercial, office, hotel, and residential uses. Beyond adoption of the specific plan, the city has taken no actions to entitle the development to proceed.
- (a) The portion of the Old Town area bordering the Fairplex lies within 0.5 mile north-east of the eastern ends of the Brackett Field Airport runways. The area is affected by some overflights from aircraft landing from the east on the secondary (north) runway. An estimated 20% of the aircraft landings are to this runway end (Runway 26R). The area is included within *Compatibility Plan* Zone D. The aircraft fly close-in or turns northward when winds dictate that aircraft depart toward the east (Runway 8L). Typi-

cally, though, aircraft do not fly directly over the area, but to the south if approaching straight-in or to the east if entering via the standard traffic pattern. The runway is not normally used for closed-pattern, flight training operations.

- (b) Given the above aeronautical factors and the established land use functions of the surrounding area (Fairplex, commuter rail stations, Old Town), the following modifications to the compatibility criteria set forth in this *Compatibility Plan* are established for Compatibility Zone D portion of Old Town La Verne indicated as Site 1 on **Map 2C, Site-Specific Exceptions**. Other than as indicated here, the policies and criteria of this *Compatibility Plan* shall continue to apply.
- (1) New development shall be limited to a maximum intensity of 250 people per acre, averaged over Site 1. Except assembly spaces, the maximum intensity within any single acre, including all floors of a building, shall not exceed 1,000 people.
  - (2) New restaurants, theaters, conference rooms, and other assembly spaces shall be limited as follows:
    - Assembly spaces must be located on the ground floor of a building that is constructed of materials that would minimize the potential for an aircraft to intrude into the building in the event of an accident (concrete or steel walls with minimal windows facing south, west, or east; north-facing windows are acceptable in that they would be away from the normal direction of aircraft flight).
    - All assembly spaces (rooms having an occupancy of 50 or more people) shall have direct emergency egress to the exterior of the building and the ground.
    - Assembly spaces shall represent a combined total of no more than 10% of the total floor area of the building.
  - (3) A residential density of up to 70 dwelling units per acre shall be allowed. Hotel rooms may be substituted for residential dwellings on a 1:1 basis.
  - (4) All dwelling units and hotel rooms shall incorporate sound attenuation in accordance with Section 2.2.2.
  - (5) All buildings and other structures must meet the airspace protection criteria set forth in Section 2.4.
  - (6) An aviation easement shall be dedicated to the County of Los Angeles in accordance with Section 2.6.1.

2.7.3. *Los Angeles County Fairplex (Pomona Section)*: The Los Angeles County Fairplex property consists of approximately 455 acres, mostly within the City of Pomona and, as discussed in Section 2.7.2 above, partly within the City of La Verne. The majority of the property consists of automobile parking lots. The most intensively used sites are the drag racing spectator stands along the northwest edge and the horse racing stands and various exhibition buildings in the southeastern corner of the property. According to Fairplex officials, as many as 150,000 people may occupy the property during the fair. Other events throughout the year also attract large crowds. However, on over half the days of the year, usage is minimal. Fairplex officials contemplate redeveloping various portions of the grounds into more intensive uses potentially including: replacement of the horse racing track with a multi-use stadium; hotel and conference facilities; office space reusing existing horse barns; and, east of White Avenue, a shopping center.

- (a) The central portion of the fairgrounds, consisting mostly of parking lots and horse barns, lies along the extended Brackett Field Airport runway centerlines and lies within Compatibility Zones A and B1. The horse racing track and adjacent areas are beneath where aircraft fly a close-in traffic pattern to Runway 26L, the predominantly used runway, or make early turns to the south when departing toward the east. This area is within Compatibility Zone C1. The remainder of the Fairplex, areas along the southern and eastern sides, are within Compatibility Zone D.
- (b) Despite the safety concerns that high-intensity uses close to the ends of runways represent (noise is not an issue for most activities at the Fairplex), the fairgrounds and Brackett Field Airport have existed side-by-side since the 1930s with minimal conflict. Established practice by Fairplex staff is to alert airport management and airport traffic control tower personnel when events (such as drag strip activities or fireworks displays) or temporary structures (such as cranes or carnival rides) at the Fairplex may interfere with normal airport operations. The flying public is then notified via published materials and the airport website as well as Notice to Airmen, Automatic Terminal Information Service, and Automated Weather Observing System messages that operations at the airport are curtailed.
- (c) The intent of this *Compatibility Plan* is not to interfere with the history and on-going relationship between the airport and Fairplex, but to ensure that the inherent risks are not substantially increased in the future. The following site-specific special policies are therefore established. Other than as indicated here, the policies and criteria of this *Compatibility Plan* shall continue to apply.
- (1) All Zones: All proposed permanent development of the Fairplex property shall be subject to ALUC review as provided for under Sections 1.4.1(a) and (b). Short-term, temporary uses removed within 45 days of installation shall not be subject to ALUC review provided that these uses are not significantly different from current uses in terms of usage intensity, frequency of use, height, or other factors that represent compatibility concerns.
  - (2) All Zones: All buildings and other structures must meet the airspace protection criteria set forth in Section 2.4. Exceptions are allowed, and no ALUC review is required, for temporary structures reviewed and authorized by the Federal Aviation Administration through the standard aeronautical study process.
  - (3) Compatibility Zone A: No new development shall be permitted. Fairplex officials will continue to coordinate with airport management and air traffic control tower personnel regarding appropriate aeronautical measures or facility usage limitations to be taken during events that utilize the drag racing stands that lie within this zone.
  - (4) Compatibility Zones B1 and C1 West of White Avenue (Site 2 on **Map 2C**): Fairplex management plans to convert the nine existing buildings known as Barrett's Barns, as well as adjacent smaller barns to the southeast, to an undetermined mixture of uses such as offices, light industrial, retail, food manufacturing, dining, trade school, and mini-storage. The site occupies an area of approximately 23.2 acres and, with anticipated elimination of the smaller buildings to create auto parking, will have a remaining total of approximately 220,000 square feet of floor area. The site straddles the Zones B1/C1 boundary with approximately half the acreage situated in each zone, but nearly 85% of the building space in Zone B1.

The planned uses shall be deemed compatible provided that the following conditions/assumptions are met:

- Buildings will remain single story excluding loft space having only low-intensity occupancy. The total number of occupants for all uses, both indoors and outdoors, at any one time during typical busy periods shall not exceed 2,100 (this number is calculated using the estimated 85%/15% split of building floor area between Zones B1 and C1 with these zones allowing 80 people per acre and 150 people per acre, respectively, as sitewide averages).
  - The typical maximum occupancy of each of the nine buildings shall be limited to 450 people (this criterion follows the Zone C1 single-acre limit rather than the more restrictive 160 people per single-acre limit normally applicable in Zone B1; the site of each individual building is approximately 1.0 acre).
  - Any other buildings or uses remaining or to be built on the site shall be restricted to uses consistent with the basic intensity criteria set forth in **Table 2A** and the number of occupants of those buildings and uses shall be included in determining compliance with the 2,100 persons sitewide occupancy limit indicated above.
  - If a trade school is to be among the uses of the site, it shall not be considered to be a children's (K-12) school provided that it will be open to students of varying ages and not intended exclusively for children.
- (5) Compatibility Zone B1 East of White Avenue (Site 3 on **Map 2C**): A sitewide average usage intensity of up to 120 people per acre shall be allowed. Among the uses that are conditionally compatible with this intensity limit are: 2 or 3 story office buildings; 1 or 2 story retail facilities provided that eating/drinking establishments and similar high-intensity uses comprise no more than 15% of the total floor area; and 1 or 2 story adult education (including college) facilities. To meet the intensity limit, it is presumed that much of the site will be devoted to surface parking. Hotels, dormitories, or other forms of short-term or long-term lodging are incompatible.
- (6) Compatibility Zone C1 North: Except for the area within the City of La Verne addressed by Section 2.7.2 (Site 1 on **Map 2C**), future development or redevelopment within this portion of Compatibility Zone C1 shall adhere to the basic criteria for the zone.
- (7) Compatibility Zone C1 East of White Avenue (Site 4 on **Map 2C**): Future development or redevelopment in this area shall be allowed to have a sitewide average intensity of up to 200 people per acre. The maximum intensity within any single acre shall not exceed 1,000 people. Conditions as listed in Section 2.7.2(b) Paragraphs (2) through (5) shall apply. Most uses in buildings up to 2 or 3 stories for moderately high intensity uses (retail, classrooms) or up to 4 stories for less intensive uses (offices, hotels) potentially comply with these limits and are therefore conditionally compatible.
- (8) Compatibility Zones C1 and D South (Site 5 on **Map 2C**): An outdoor or indoor major assembly facility or facilities having a total capacity of up to 25,000 people shall be allowed within the area designated as Site 5 situated mostly in Zone C1 and partly in Zone D southeast of the airport. Additionally, up to four events per year shall be allowed to have a total capacity of up to 40,000 people provided that the additional capacity is not accommodated in fixed seating. Capacities greater

than these amounts are not allowed even if the proposal is for multiple facilities that would not ordinarily be used simultaneously.

- The designated site encompasses the existing horse racing track and its approximately 10,000-seat spectator stands. With temporary seating and/or standing room, the capacity of the existing facility is estimated at 40,000 people.
  - Any new facility (e.g. a stadium) may include all or part of the existing facility. In measuring compliance with the above capacity limits, the capacity of any remaining portions of the existing facility shall be counted.
  - Facility lighting must be designed so as not to interfere with the vision of pilots or air traffic controllers.
  - As a tradeoff for allowing high-intensity development within this area, intensities for future development or redevelopment within the remainder of Compatibility Zone C1 shall adhere to the basic intensity limits of that zone.
  - This exception is provided with the understanding that the airport will inform pilots to avoid overflight of the facility when events are taking place.
- (9) Compatibility Zones D and E: The basic criteria for Compatibility Zones D and E shall apply except that a large assembly facility of any size situated entirely within these zones in lieu of a site in Zone C1 shall be allowed and the Paragraph (8) exception shall be void.

2.7.4. *University of La Verne Campus West:* The University of La Verne controls approximately 50 acres of vacant land north of Puddingstone Drive and west of Wheeler Avenue and known as Campus West. A large flood control channel runs through the center of the site. In January 2015, the University completed a *Facilities and Technology Master Plan* that includes planning for Campus West. An athletic complex, with spectator stands having a capacity of up to 299 people per field, is located on the northern portion of the site and is deemed an existing use for the purpose of this Compatibility Plan. When special events at the complex exceed the aforementioned capacity, the University of La Verne coordinates with the airport operator to ensure that compatibility between the airport and university is maintained. Contemplated uses for the southern part of the site had included housing for up to 5,000 graduate students, business park, and/or single- or multi-family residential, but no specific proposal is shown in the January 2015 plan.

- (a) The Campus West site lies adjacent to the north side of Brackett Field Airport and is designated as Compatibility Zone D. The site is impacted by some noise from fixed-wing aircraft on the nearby runways, but its location near the midpoint of the runways minimizes the safety concerns. The greater impact is from helicopters. A commonly used flight-training pattern takes helicopters from the north runway near the control tower, then northward along the channel to the railroad tracks, then proceeding eastward to Fairplex Drive, and back again to the runway (or the reverse when easterly winds prevail). Construction of a defined helipad adjacent to the runway is planned, but would not significantly alter this pattern.
- (b) The following site-specific special policies shall apply to Campus West:
- (1) New field lighting shall be shielded to minimize glare to pilots and air traffic controllers to the satisfaction of airport management.
  - (2) Residential uses shall be limited to combined total of no more than 70 student rooms and/or multi-family units per acre. Additionally, the total occupancy of the

development, including the residential unit occupants and the occupants of any nonresidential components, shall comply with the basic intensity criteria for that zone (maximums of 300 people per acre sitewide average and 1,000 people in single one-acre area). All structures must meet the height-limit criteria as set forth in Section 2.4.

- (3) Residences, student housing, lodging, classroom buildings, and other buildings containing noise-sensitive uses shall incorporate sound attenuation design as indicated by Section 2.2.2.
- (4) An aviation easement shall be dedicated to the County of Los Angeles in accordance with Section 2.6.1.

Land Use Category <sup>1</sup> <i>Multiple land use categories and compatibility criteria may apply to a project</i>	Compatibility Zone							Additional Criteria <sup>2</sup> <i>Intensity criteria apply to all nonresidential uses including ones shown as "Normally Compatible" (green) Additional conditions listed below apply to uses listed as "Conditional" (yellow) in a particular zone</i>
	A	B1	B2	C1	C2	D	E	
<b>Max. Sitewide Avg. Intensity (people/acre)</b> <b>Max. Single-Acre Intensity (people/acre) <sup>3</sup></b>	10 20	80 160	150 450	150 450	300 1,000	no limit	no limit	
<i>General Characteristics</i>								
Any use having more than 3 habitable floors <sup>4</sup>	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	C1: Allowed only where site-specific exceptions are identified in Section 2.7
Any use having structures (including poles or antennas) or trees 35 to 100 feet in height	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	B1/2, C1/2: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Any use having structures (including poles or antennas) or trees more than 100 feet in height	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	C1/2, D, E: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Any use having the potential to cause an increase in the attraction of birds or other wildlife	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	C2, D, E: Avoid use or provide mitigation consistent with FAA regulations <sup>5</sup>
Any use creating visual or electronic hazards to flight <sup>6</sup>	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	
<i>Outdoor Uses (limited or no activities in buildings)</i>								
Natural Land Areas: woods, brush lands, desert	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	A: Objects above runway elevation not allowed in OFA <sup>7</sup> A, B1/2, C1: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Water: flood plains, wetlands, lakes, reservoirs *	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	A: Objects above runway elevation not allowed in OFA <sup>7</sup> All: Avoid new features that attract more birds or provide mitigation consistent with FAA regulations <sup>5</sup>
Agriculture (except residences and livestock): field crops, orchards, vineyards, pasture, range land *	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	A: Not allowed in OFA <sup>7</sup> All: Avoid crops that attract birds
Livestock Uses: feed lots, stockyards, breeding, fish hatcheries, horse stables → *	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	B1 - E: Avoid uses that attract birds; exercise caution with uses involving noise-sensitive animals
Outdoor Major Assembly Facilities (capacity ≥1,000 people): spectator-oriented outdoor stadiums, amphitheaters, fairgrounds, zoos →	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	D, E: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended function; exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
Outdoor Large Assembly Facilities (capacity 300 to 999 people): spectator-oriented outdoor stadiums, amphitheaters →	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	B2, C1/2: Ensure intensity criteria met; exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
Group Recreation (limited spectator stands): athletic fields, water recreation facilities, picnic areas →	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met; not allowed if intended primarily for use by children; exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
Small/Non-Group Recreation: golf courses, tennis courts, shooting ranges → *	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	B1/2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met; not allowed if intended primarily for use by children; exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
Local Parks: neighborhood parks, playgrounds →	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	B1/2: Must have little or no permanent recreational facilities (ball fields, etc.); exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential

**Table 2A**  
**Basic Compatibility Criteria**  
**Brackett Field Airport**

Camping: campgrounds, recreational vehicle/motor home parks →								B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met B2, C1/2: Avoid if disruption by aircraft noise unacceptable
Cemeteries (except chapels)								B1: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B] B2, C1/2: Avoid if disruption by aircraft noise unacceptable
<i>Residential and Lodging Uses</i>		Maximum Allowable Floor Area Ratio						
Single-Family Residential (<8 d.u./acre): detached dwellings, townhouses, mobile homes, bed & breakfast inns →								C2: Ensure sound attenuation criteria met [see Section 2.2.2]
Multi-Family Residential (≥8 d.u./acre): condominiums, apartments, mixed residential/nonresidential uses →								C1: Allowed only where site-specific exceptions are identified in Section 2.7 C2: Maximum 15 d.u./acre sitewide average, 30 d.u./single acre; ensure sound attenuation criteria met [see Sections 2.2.2 and 2.3.1(a)]
Long-Term Lodging (>30 nights): extended-stay hotels, dormitories →								C1: Ensure intensity criteria met C1/2: Ensure sound attenuation criteria met [see Section 2.2.2]
Short-Term Lodging (≤ 30 nights): hotels, motels, other transient lodging (except conference/assembly facilities) [approx. 200 s.f./person]			0.69	0.69	1.38			B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met C2: Ensure sound attenuation criteria met [see Section 2.2.2]
Congregate Care: retirement homes, assisted living, intermediate care facilities →								C2: Ensure sound attenuation criteria met [see Section 2.2.2]
<i>Educational and Institutional Uses</i>		Maximum Allowable Floor Area Ratio						
Family day care homes (≤14 children) →								C2: Only small family care homes (≤8 children) as permitted by state law <sup>8</sup>
Children's Schools: K-12, day care centers (>14 children); school libraries →								D: New sites or expansion of existing sites not allowed; expansion of facilities on existing sites limited to one-time capacity increase of no more than 50 students [see Section 2.6.3(c)]
Adult Education classroom space: adult schools, colleges, universities [approx. 40 s.f./person]			0.14	0.14				B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met; also see individual components of campus facilities (e.g., assembly facilities, gymnasiums, offices)
Indoor Small Assembly Facilities (capacity <300 people): community libraries; art galleries; museums; exhibition space → [approx. 100 s.f./person]					0.69			C2: Ensure intensity criteria met; avoid outdoor spaces intended for noise-sensitive activities; otherwise allowed only where site-specific exceptions are identified in Section 2.7
Indoor Large Assembly Facilities (capacity 300 to 999 people): movie theaters, places of worship, cemetery chapels, mortuaries [approx. 15 s.f./person]					0.10			B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met [see Section 2.3.2]
Indoor Major Assembly Facilities (capacity ≥1,000 people): auditoriums, conference centers, concert halls, indoor arenas								C1/2, D: Allowed only where site-specific exceptions are identified in Section 2.7
Indoor Recreation: gymnasiums, club houses, athletic clubs, dance studios [approx. 60 s.f./person]			0.21	0.21				B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met
In-Patient Medical: hospitals, mental hospitals, nursing homes →								C2: No new sites or land acquisition; replacement/expansion of existing facilities limited to existing size
Out-Patient Medical: health care centers, clinics [approx. 240 s.f./person]			0.83	0.83				C1: Ensure intensity criteria met
Penal Institutions: prisons, reformatories								

Table 2A (continued)

Public Safety Facilities: police, fire stations								B2: Allowed only if airport serving C1/2: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function
<i>Commercial, Office, and Service Uses</i>		Maximum Allowable Floor Area Ratio						
Major Retail: regional shopping centers, 'big box' retail [approx. 110 s.f./person]					0.76			C1: Capacity <1,000 people per bldg; evaluate eating/drinking areas separately if >10% of total floor area
Local Retail: community/neighborhood shopping centers, grocery stores [approx. 170 s.f./person]			0.59	0.59				B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met; evaluate eating/drinking areas separately if >10% of total floor area
Eating/Drinking Establishments: restaurants, fast-food dining, bars [approx. 60 s.f./person]			0.21	0.21				B2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met
Limited Retail/Wholesale: furniture, automobiles, heavy equipment, lumber yards, nurseries [approx. 250 s.f./person]		0.46	0.86	0.86				B1/2: Design site to place parking inside and bldgs outside of zone if possible B1/2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met
Offices: professional services, doctors, finance, civic; radio, television & recording studios, office space associated with other listed uses [approx. 215 s.f./person]		0.40	0.74	0.74				B1: Allowable only if <80 people per bldg B1/2: Design site to place parking inside and bldgs outside of zone if possible B1/2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met
Personal & Miscellaneous Services: barbers, car washes, print shops [approx. 200 s.f./person]		0.37	0.69	0.69				B1: Allowable only if <80 people per bldg B1/2: Design site to place parking inside and bldgs outside of zone if possible B1/2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria met
Vehicle Fueling Facilities: gas stations, trucking & transportation terminals								B2: Allowable only for aircraft fueling
<i>Industrial, Manufacturing, and Storage Uses</i>		Maximum Allowable Floor Area Ratio						
Hazardous Materials Production: oil refineries, chemical plants *								D, E: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended function; generation of steam or thermal plumes not allowed
Heavy Industrial *								C2: Bulk storage of hazardous (flammable, explosive, corrosive, or toxic) materials not allowed D: Bulk storage of hazardous materials allowed only for on-site use; permitting agencies to evaluate possible need for special measures to minimize hazards if struck by aircraft; generation of steam or thermal plumes not allowed
Light Industrial, High Intensity: food products preparation, electronic equipment [approx. 200 s.f./person]			0.69	0.69	1.38			B2, C1/2: Ensure intensity criteria are met; bulk storage of hazardous (flammable, explosive, corrosive, or toxic) materials allowed only for on-site use; permitting agencies to evaluate possible need for special measures to minimize hazards if struck by aircraft
Light Industrial, Low Intensity: machine shops, wood products, auto repair [approx. 350 s.f./person]		0.64	1.21	1.21	2.41			B1/2, C1: Ensure intensity criteria are met B1/2, C1/2, D: Bulk storage of hazardous (flammable, explosive, corrosive, or toxic) materials allowed only for on-site use; permitting agencies to evaluate possible need for special measures to minimize hazards if struck by aircraft
Research & Development [approx. 300 s.f./person]			1.03	1.03	2.07			B2, C1/2: Ensure intensity criteria are met B2, C1/2, D: Bulk storage of hazardous (flammable, explosive, corrosive, or toxic) materials allowed only for on-site use; permitting agencies to evaluate possible need for special measures to minimize hazards if struck by aircraft

Table 2A (continued)

Indoor Storage: wholesale sales, warehouses, mini/other indoor storage, barns, greenhouses [approx. 1,000 s.f./person]		1.84	3.51	3.51				B1: Ensure intensity criteria met B1/2, C1: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Outdoor Storage: public works yards, automobile dismantling								B1: Ensure intensity criteria are met; ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Mining & Extraction *								B1/2, C1/2: Generation of dust clouds, smoke, steam plumes not allowed; ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
<i>Transportation, Communication, and Utilities</i>								
Airport Terminals: airline, general aviation								C1: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur (see Map 2B)
Rail & Bus Stations								B1/2, C1: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function
Transportation Routes: road & rail rights-of-way, bus stops								A: Not allowed in Object Free Area <sup>7</sup> A, B1: Avoid road intersections if traffic congestion occurs; ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Auto Parking: surface lots, structures								B1: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Communications Facilities: emergency communications, broadcast & cell towers *								C2: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function C2, D: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur [see Map 2B]
Power Plants: primary, peaker, alternative energy *								D, E: Primary power plants allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function; ensure all facilities and associated power lines meet airspace protection criteria (height, thermal plumes, glare, etc.) [see Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3]
Electrical Substations *								C2: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function C2, D: Ensure airspace obstruction does not occur for facility or power lines
Wastewater Facilities: treatment, disposal								C1/2: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function
Solid Waste Disposal Facilities: landfill, incineration *								D, E: Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function
Solid Waste Transfer Facilities, Recycle Centers *								C2, D, E: Ensure that facility does not attract birds

Table 2A (continued)

Land Use Acceptability		Interpretation/Comments
	Normally Compatible	Normal examples of the use are presumed to comply with the noise, safety, and airspace protection criteria. Atypical examples of a use may require review to ensure compliance with usage intensity and height limit criteria.
	Conditional	Use is compatible if indicated usage intensity and other listed conditions are met. For the purposes of these criteria, "avoid" is intended as cautionary guidance, not a prohibition of the use.
	Incompatible	Use should not be permitted under any normal circumstances. Limited exceptions are possible for site-specific special circumstances. See Section 2.1.5 and Section 2.7.

Notes
<p>➔ Indicates land use that is or may be highly noise sensitive. Exercise caution with regard to approval of outdoor uses—evaluate potential for aircraft noise to disrupt the activity. Indoor uses may require addition of sound attenuation to structure. See Section 3.2 for criteria.</p> <p>☀ Indicates land use that may attract birds, generate dust, produce smoke or steam plumes, create electronic interference, or otherwise pose hazards to flight. See Section 3.4 for criteria.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Land uses not specifically listed shall be evaluated using the criteria for similar uses. Occupancy Load Factors (square feet/person) cited for many listed uses are based on information from various sources and are intended to represent busy-period usage for typical examples of the land use category; they can be used as a factor in determining the appropriate land use category for unlisted uses or atypical examples of a use.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Dedication of an avigation easement to the County of Los Angeles is required as a condition for approval of any proposed residential or nonresidential development, except ministerial actions associated with modification of existing single-family residences, situated on a site that lies completely or partially within any of the following: Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, C1, or C2; the Critical Airspace Protection Zone; or, as defined by FAR Part 77 and shown on Map 2B – Airspace Protection, the area beneath the approach or transitional surfaces. A recorded overflight notification is required for any residential development in Compatibility Zones D or E, except where an avigation easement is provided because of location within the Critical Airspace Protection Zone.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Usage intensity calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outdoors. Local agencies may make exceptions for rare special events (e.g., an air show at the airport) for which a facility is not designed and normally not used and for which extra safety precautions can be taken as appropriate. The ALUC shall calculate usage intensities in accordance with the methodologies cited in Sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4.</p> <p><sup>4</sup> The intent of this criterion is to facilitate evacuation of a building if it were to be hit by an aircraft. It is separate from the height limits set for airspace protection purposes.</p> <p><sup>5</sup> No proposed use shall be allowed that would create an increased attraction for wildlife and that is inconsistent with FAA rules and regulations including, but not limited to, FAA Advisory Circulars 150/5200-33B, <i>Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports</i>, and 150/5200-34A, <i>Construction or Establishment of Landfills Near Public Airports</i>. Of particular concern are landfills and certain recreational or agricultural uses that attract large flocks of birds which pose bird strike hazards to aircraft in flight.</p> <p><sup>6</sup> Specific characteristics to be avoided include: sources of glare (such as from mirrored or other highly reflective structures or building features) or bright lights (including search lights and laser light displays); distracting lights that could be mistaken for airport lights; sources of dust, steam, or smoke that may impair pilots' vision; sources of steam or other emissions that cause thermal plumes or other forms of unstable air; and sources of electrical interference with aircraft communications or navigation.</p> <p><sup>7</sup> Object Free Area (OFA): Dimensions are established by FAA airport design standards for the runway.</p> <p><sup>8</sup> Small family day care homes provide family day care for eight or fewer children (Health and Safety Code Section 1596.78).</p>


**Table 2A (continued)**

Zone	Noise and Overflight Factors	Safety and Airspace Protection Factors
A Runway Protection Zone and Within Object Free Area	Noise Impact: Very High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of area is within CNEL 65 dB contour</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Very High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lateral to runways, zone boundary defined by Object Free Area Line as depicted on adopted Airport Layout Plan drawing</li> <li>Length set to include Runway Protection Zones as indicated on Airport Layout Plan drawing</li> <li>Some 56% of off-runway general aviation accidents near airports occur in this zone</li> </ul>
B1 Inner Approach/Departure Zone	Noise Impact: High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encompasses remainder of CNEL 65 dB contour beyond runway ends</li> <li>Single-event noise sufficient to disrupt wide range of land use activities including indoors if windows open</li> </ul>	Risk Level: High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encompasses areas overflown by aircraft at low altitudes—typically only 200 to 400 feet above the runway elevation.</li> <li>Some 15% of off-runway general aviation accidents near airports take place here</li> <li>Object heights restricted to as little as 50 feet</li> </ul>
B2 Adjacent to Runway	Noise Impact: Moderate to High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within CNEL 60 dB contour or higher</li> <li>Exposed to loud single-event noise from takeoffs and jet thrust-reverse on landing; also from pre-flight run-ups</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Low to Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area not normally overflown by aircraft; primary risk from aircraft (especially twins) losing directional control on takeoff</li> <li>About 3% of off-runway general aviation accidents near airports happen in this zone</li> <li>Object heights restricted to as little as 35 feet</li> </ul>
C1 Turning and Extended Approach Zone	Noise Impact: Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly exposed to above CNEL 55 dB</li> <li>Aircraft typically at or below 1,000-foot traffic pattern altitude; individual events occasionally loud enough to intrude upon indoor activities</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes areas where aircraft turn from base to final approach legs of standard traffic pattern and descend from traffic pattern altitude</li> <li>Zone also includes areas where departing aircraft normally complete transition from takeoff power and flap settings to climb mode and have begun to turn to their en route heading</li> <li>Some 11% of off-runway general aviation accidents near airports occur here</li> <li>Object heights restricted to as little as 50 feet</li> </ul>
C2 Extended Departure Zone	Noise Impact: Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly exposed to above CNEL 60 dB</li> <li>Affected by noise of individual departures</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Low to Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On west, beyond where risk from departure accidents is highest; some arrival accident risk, though relatively few arrivals occur over area</li> </ul>
D Helicopter Flight Training Zone	Noise Impact: Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area subject to helicopter flight training noise and vibration impacts as identified on Exhibit 5, Noise and Overflight Factors Map.</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Low to Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North area between Site Specific Exception Areas 1 and 6 that is regularly over-flown by light helicopters in training flight pattern</li> </ul>
D Primary Traffic Patterns	Noise Impact: Moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise more of a concern with respect to individual loud events than with cumulative noise contours</li> <li>Portions of CNEL 55 dB contour extend into this zone</li> <li>Includes areas where aircraft are less than 1,000 feet above runway elevation while on an instrument approach</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>About 13% of general aviation accidents take place in this zone, but the large area encompassed means a low likelihood of accident occurrence in any given location</li> <li>Risk concern is primarily with uses for which potential consequences are severe (e.g. very-high-intensity activities in a confined area)</li> <li>Object height limits generally 100 feet above runway elevation</li> </ul>
E Other Airport Environs	Noise Impact: Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond CNEL 55 dB contour</li> <li>Occasional overflights intrusive to some outdoor activities</li> </ul>	Risk Level: Low <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 2% of near-airport accidents here</li> <li>Object height limits 150 feet or more above runway elevation</li> </ul>

Table 2B

## Compatibility Zone Delineation

### Brackett Field Airport



**Legend**

- Airport Influence Area
- Runway
- Airport Boundary
- City Limits

**Compatibility Zones**

- Zone A
- Zone B1
- Zone B2
- Zone C1
- Zone C2
- Zone D
- Zone E


**Notes**

1. See Table 2A for applicable criteria.
2. See Map 2C and Section 2.7 for site-specific exceptions.

**Brackett Field Airport**  
**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
 (Draft: 11/3/2015)

Map 2A


**Compatibility Policy Zones**



Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015

Base map source: Los Angeles County (2013).





**Legend**

- Airport Influence Area
- Runway
- City Limits
- Part 77 Surfaces**
- Part 77 Surface
- 50' interval
- FAR High Terrain Area<sup>1</sup>
- Critical Airspace Protection Zone<sup>2</sup>
- Topographic Contours**
- 20 ft. Interval
- 100 ft. Interval

**Notes**

1. The High Terrain Area encompasses locations where the ground elevation exceeds or is within 35 feet beneath an Airspace Protection Surface as defined by FAR Part 77 for the airport.
2. The Critical Airspace Protection Zone consists of the FAR Part 77 primary surface and the area beneath portions of the approach and transitional surfaces to where these surfaces intersect with horizontal surface together with the High Terrain Area.


**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(May 2015 Draft)

Map 2B

**Airspace Protection Map**





**Legend**

-  Runway
  -  Airport Boundary
  -  City Limits
  -  Compatibility Zones
  -  Los Angeles County Fairplex Property
- 
-  **1** Old Town La Verne Transit Oriented Development (Zone D North exception)
  -  **2** Los Angeles County Fairplex (Zones B1/C1 West of White Avenue exception)
  -  **3** Fairplex (Zone B1 East of White Avenue exception)
  -  **4** Fairplex (Zone C1 East exception)
  -  **5** Fairplex (Zones C1/D South exception)
  -  **6** University of La Verne West Campus (Zone D North exception)

**Notes**

1. See Section 2.7 for policy exceptions applicable within these areas.

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(Draft: 11/3/2015)

Map 2C

**Site-Specific Exception Areas**



Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015

Base map source: Los Angeles County (2013)



---

# Background Data: Brackett Field Airport and Environs

## OVERVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to document information regarding Brackett Field Airport and its environs that provides the setting upon which this *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Compatibility Plan)* is based. The physical configuration and operational characteristics of the airport are critical determinants of the impacts that aircraft activity has on surrounding land uses. Furthermore, the character of current and planned land uses in the surrounding area must be weighed in the development of the compatibility criteria. Lastly, this information is directly relevant to assessment of the environmental impacts of the plan's adoption and implementation as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The environmental impacts are examined in a companion document.

For the purposes of data gathering, a study area for the *Compatibility Plan* was defined to encompass locations within slightly under three miles from the airport runways. This distance is based upon airspace protection requirements as described later in this chapter.

This introductory text provides a general overview of the airport and its environs. Further details are included in the tables and maps.

## BRACKETT FIELD AIRPORT

### Location and History

Brackett Field Airport is located within the San Gabriel Valley of eastern Los Angeles County, 25 miles east of downtown Los Angeles. While the airport property lies predominantly within the City of La Verne, lands immediately beyond the eastern and western ends of the runways fall within the jurisdictions of the cities of Pomona and San Dimas, respectively. Other jurisdictions within the *Compatibility Plan* study area are Claremont and Glendora. Small portions of Covina and Walnut lie along the outer edge of the study area.

An airport has existed at the current site since the 1930s. Originally a privately owned facility, the airport was acquired by the County of Los Angeles in 1955. After constructing many improvements in-

cluding paving the dirt runway, the facility was dedicated as a County airport in August 1958. A parallel, second runway was added in the 1980s.

Today, Brackett Field Airport occupies 276 acres and has space for parking approximately 545 aircraft. The longest of the two runways has a length of 4,839 feet and offers full instrument landing system (ILS) capabilities from the east, although with high (1-mile visibility) minimums due to nearby terrain. The airport primarily supports small, general aviation aircraft, but also handles mid-size business jets and helicopters.

Los Angeles County continues to own the airport property and major facilities. Overall responsibility for the airport rests with the County Department of Public Works Aviation Division. The Aviation Division currently contracts day-to-day management and operation of the facility to a private enterprise, American Airports Corporation.

### **Status of Airport Plans**

The most recent comprehensive master plan for Brackett Field Airport was completed in 1992 and adopted by the County Board of Supervisors at that time. An airport layout plan drawing showing existing facilities and proposed improvements was prepared as part of the master plan document and has been updated several times since. The most recent airport layout plan that has been submitted to and approved by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is dated February 2003. Subsequent updates—the latest in April 2010—have been prepared to reflect completed construction, but have not been formally submitted for FAA approval.

Proposed facility improvements envisioned by the 1992 master plan are relatively minor in terms of implications for land use compatibility. Some of the identified improvements have been completed. Among the ones remaining are widening of the primary runway from its current 75 feet to 100 feet and construction of helicopter landing pads in the northeast corner of the property. Construction of additional aircraft hangars and other building area facilities is also indicated. No changes to the instrument approach capabilities are proposed.

California state law (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)) requires that a compatibility plan be based upon a current airport master plan or, if one is not available, upon an airport layout plan. Use of an airport layout plan for compatibility planning purposes requires acceptance by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Aeronautics and the Division requires that the layout plan be one that the FAA has approved. Both the 2003 and 2010 Airport Layout Plans were submitted to the Division and the 2003 version, being the latest with FAA approval, was accepted as the basis for this *Compatibility Plan* (letter dated May 20, 2013).

### **Airport Activity Forecasts**

Because the Brackett Field Airport Master Plan is outdated and does not reflect current activity conditions, preparation of activity forecasts for the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan* has been necessary. Forecasts are primarily a factor with regard to noise impacts.

For compatibility planning purposes, forecasts must have a time horizon of at least 20 years (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)). In general, forecasts should be at the high end of the plausible range of possibilities. The rationale behind this concept is that, once incompatible development is allowed closer to the airport based on smaller noise contours, it would be virtually impossible to undo if activity increases more than expected.

### **Current Activity**

Current (2013) annual activity at Brackett Field Airport is approximately 99,300 operations (takeoffs plus landings) according to the FAA’s “Terminal Area Forecast” data. Calendar year 2012 activity reported by the control tower equaled 89,977. The difference reflects the different years represented. Taking into account the estimated number of operations during the hours (9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) when the tower is closed, the 2014 total activity level is estimated at 102,000. This activity level is a significant decline from past tower counts: 114,189 in 2010; 252,466 in 2000; and 289,707, the historic high, in 1990.

### **Forecast Scenarios**

National and regional forecasts of aviation activity together with historical activity data for Brackett Field Airport provide the foundation for several possible forecast scenarios.

- *SCAG Los Angeles County Baseline Forecast* – In early 2012, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) prepared regional forecasts of general aviation activity. The forecasts are done on a county-by-county basis, not for individual airports. SCAG’s baseline forecast anticipates a substantial region-wide decline in general aviation activity. For Los Angeles County, the forecast shows a decline from 1,345,000 general aviation aircraft operations in 2010 to only 774,000 in 2035. Applying this ratio to the 2010 Brackett Field Airport tower count, and adding a small amount for night operations, results in only 66,300 total aircraft operations in 2035. Regardless of whether this pessimistic forecast is indeed what the future holds for general aviation, it is not an appropriate assumption to use for compatibility planning purposes. At the very least, the impacts of current activity levels (90,700 annual operations) must be considered.
- *SCAG Los Angeles County Arrested Decline Forecast* – SCAG’s most optimistic forecast (there also is a mid-range, reduced decline forecast) indicates a modest increase in aircraft activity in Los Angeles County, although a continued decline in the other five counties of the region. For Los Angeles County, the 2035 forecast is 1,789,000 general aviation operations, an approximately 33% increase (1.19% annually) over the 2010 number. For Brackett Field Airport, a similar increase relative to 2010 would result in 153,400 total operations (including approximately 1% after tower hours).
- *FAA National Forecast* – The FAA annually issues 20-year forecasts of various aspects of aviation nationally. For general aviation, the forecasts examine the numbers of active aircraft and hours flown rather than aircraft operations. The 2014 forecast indicates a continued small decline in the numbers of active piston, fixed-wing aircraft, but a strong growth rate of 3.2% annually for turbine-powered, fixed-wing planes. The numbers of experimental and sport aircraft as well as rotorcraft are expected to rise as well. The net result is a projected 0.5% annual growth in the active fleet nationally for the 2014 to 2034 period. The total number of general aviation hours flown is expected to increase even more—an average rate of 1.7% annually over the 20-year forecast period. Given that Brackett Field Airport is capable of handling the full range of general aviation aircraft except the largest business jets, its fleet mix is probably fairly typical of the national average (no attempt at an exact comparison has been made). If the annual growth rate in aircraft operations is assumed to be somewhere between the active aircraft and hours flown growth rates, then applying the national numbers to Brackett Field Airport’s 2012 count and extrapolating to 2035 would result in approximately 118,000 total operations.
- *FAA Brackett Field Airport Terminal Area Forecast* – Using its national forecast as a starting point, the FAA annually prepares a “Terminal Area Forecast” (TAF) for individual airports that are part of the

national airport system. These forecasts are a top down type of forecast and only minimally consider unique local conditions. For Brackett Field Airport, the January 2014 forecast shows a slow growth in activity from approximately 91,000 operations at present to about 95,900 operations in 2035 and 97,200 in 2040. These numbers equate to an average annual growth rate of approximately 0.24%, but ignore that the same source reports the 2013 activity at over 99,300 operations.

- *Brackett Field Airport Historic Activity* – All of the preceding scenarios produce forecasts well below the airport’s historic high of 289,707 total operations in 1990 or even the 252,466 count from as recently as 2000. A scenario to be considered is whether the airport could again approach these numbers.

As noted initially, the usual approach to forecasts for compatibility plans is to aim toward the high side of the plausible range of scenarios. While a return to the historic levels appears unlikely, a number somewhere in between the historic high (289,707 annual operations) and the current activity level (approximately 102,000 annual operations) is probably realistic. Accordingly, the forecast selected for this *Compatibility Plan* is 180,000 total annual aircraft operations which are approximately double the current activity level. This forecast is not date specific, but is intended to represent a time frame of 2035 or beyond.

## SURROUNDING LAND USES

Most of Brackett Field Airport’s surroundings are heavily urbanized. The major exceptions are to the southwest and south where Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park, Puddingstone Reservoir, and Mountain Meadows Golf Course are located. Also, to the east is the Los Angeles County Fairplex which includes large areas of paved parking lots. During the annual fair and other major events, the entire fairgrounds are intensively occupied. The most intensive year-round uses nearby are in the downtowns and old towns of San Dimas to the northwest and La Verne to the northeast of the airport.

Very few large properties having development potential remain in the airport environs. Most future development is expected to consist of either small infill projects or redevelopment. Both San Dimas and La Verne plan greater intensities in their central areas. Particularly noteworthy because of its proximity to the airport is the high-intensity, transit-oriented development planned for southeastern La Verne around the Gold Line and Metrolink rail stations. As reflected in the *Old Town La Verne Specific Plan* adopted by the City Council in March 2013, a combination of residential and commercial uses with high-rise structures is planned. This development would directly connect with a promenade and other new or expanded facilities contemplated for the Fairplex immediately to the south of the rail stations.


## EXHIBITS

The following exhibits illustrate the compatibility factors and background information which are the basis for the *Brackett Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.

- **Exhibit 1: Airport Location**—Aerial photograph showing the airport area and jurisdictions within and near the Brackett Field Airport influence area. The airport influence area is defined by the outer edge of the airspace protection surfaces for the airport established in accordance with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4).

- **Exhibit 2: Airport Features Summary**—Summarizes information pertaining to the airport configuration, operational characteristics, and applicable planning documents.
- **Exhibits 3a and 3b: 2003 and 2010 Airport Layout Plan Drawings**—Both of these versions of the ALP derive from one originally prepared for the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Aviation Division as part of the 1992 Airport Master Plan. The 2003 drawing is the last version formally approved by the FAA. The 2010 update contains minor revisions reflecting recent construction.
- **Exhibit 4: Airport Activity Data Summary**—Summarizes existing and forecast activity levels for the airport as well as specific Integrated Noise Model (INM) inputs required for the generation of the projected noise contours.
- **Exhibit 5: Noise and Overflight Factors Map**—Depicts the noise contours calculated based upon the airport activity data in Exhibit 4. Also shown is the traffic pattern envelope representing the areas regularly overflown by aircraft as they approach or depart the airport or engage in flight training operations. The data used was a random sampling of Brackett Field Airport flight tracks obtained from Ontario International Airport’s on-line radar tracking website in January 2013.
- **Exhibit 6: Safety Factors Map**—Aircraft accident risk guidance from the Caltrans *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. The risk contours represent the relative concentrations of aircraft accident sites near general aviation airports nationwide that are similar to Brackett Field Airport and then shown relative to the Brackett Field Airport runways. The generic safety zones are ones provided by Caltrans based upon the risk contour data and are intended to serve as a starting point for addressing risks at individual airports. Depicted on the map for the south (primary) runway are the generic safety zones for a medium general aviation runway (4,000 to 5,999 feet in length) and for the north (secondary) runway are the zones for a short general aviation runway (less than 4,000 feet in length).
- **Exhibit 7: Airport Proximity Disclosure Map**—Depicts the locations within which California Civil Code Section 1103 says that disclosure of airport proximity must be provided as part of certain real estate transactions. Sellers of property near an airport, or the seller’s agents, are required to disclose information about the airport proximity if the property is also situated within a natural hazard zone; specifically: an area of potential flooding, a very high fire hazard severity zone, an area of substantial forest fire risks, an earthquake fault zone, or a seismic hazard zone as defined under state law. As indicated in Chapter 2, the *Compatibility* Plan requires that airport proximity disclosure be provided in conjunction with new residential development anywhere in the airport influence area and recommends that it be provided as part of real estate transactions involving existing residences.
- **Exhibit 8: Airport Environs Information**—Summarizes information about current and planned land uses in the environs of the Brackett Field Airport. Also listed is airport land use compatibility or other airport-related policies contained in the general plan of the affected local agencies or in applicable specific plans or other planning documents.
- **Exhibit 9: Existing Land Uses**—Maps current (2008 data, but little has changed since) land uses within the airport environs. Land use designations are based on GIS data provided by Los Angeles County.
- **Exhibit 10: General Plan Land Use**—Depicts the general plan land use designations of Los Angeles County and the cities having jurisdiction over portions of the lands within the Brackett Field Air-

port influence area. For some jurisdictions where general plan land use data is not available in GIS format, zoning designations are indicated instead.



**Legend**

-  Runway
-  Airport Boundary
-  City Limits
-  Airport Influence Area

**Notes**

1. Airport Influence Area Boundary is defined by the outer edge of the FAR Part 77 conical surface (see Airspace Protection Map, Map 2B). The radius is 14,000 feet from a point 200 feet beyond ends of Runway 8R-26L.

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(May 2015 Draft)

Exhibit 1

**Airport Location**



Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015

Aerial source: Los Angeles County (2013).



**GENERAL INFORMATION**

- *Airfield Ownership:* County of Los Angeles
- *Year Opened:* 1930s as private airport; 1958 as county
- *Property Size*
  - Fee Title: 276
  - Avigation Easements: None
  - *Airport Classification:* General Aviation
- *Airport Elevation:* 1,013 feet MSL

**RUNWAY SYSTEM****Runway 8R-26L**

- *Design Aircraft:* King Air/Citation II
- *Airport Reference Code:* B-II
- *Dimensions:*
  - 4,841 ft. long, 75 ft. wide
  - Runway 8R: Displaced Threshold: none
  - Runway 26L Displaced Threshold: 690 ft.
- *Pavement Strength (main landing gear configuration)*
  - 26,000 lbs. (single wheel)
- *Effective Gradient:* 0.9% (rising to east)
- *Marking:* Precision
- *Lighting:* MIRL; REILs both ends
- *Primary Taxiways:* Full-length parallel (Twy S) on south

**Runway 8L-26R**

- *Design Aircraft:* Light twin piston
- *Airport Reference Code:* B-I (small)
- *Dimensions:*
  - 3,661 ft. long, 75 ft. wide
  - No displaced thresholds
- *Pavement Strength (main landing gear configuration)*
  - 12,500 lbs. (single wheel)
- *Effective Gradient:* 0.9% (rising to east)
- *Marking:* Basic
- *Lighting:* None
- *Primary Taxiways:* Full-length parallel (Twy N on north)

**BUILDING AREA**

- *Location*
  - Most facilities in eastern half of south side
  - Primary T-hangar area in western half of north side
- *Aircraft Parking Capacity*
  - Hangars: 345 units
  - Tiedowns: 200
- *Other Major Facilities*
  - Control tower
  - Administration bldg
  - Fire Department & County Sheriff's Station
  - Nursery
- *Services*
  - Full-service commercial fixed base operator (FBO)
  - Fuel: Jet A, 100LL
  - Other: Aircraft rental & charter; flight instruction; major airframe & powerplant service

**TRAFFIC PATTERNS AND APPROACH PROCEDURES**

- *Airplane Traffic Patterns*
  - Runways 8R/26R: Right traffic; Rwy 8L/ 26L: Left traffic
  - Pattern altitude: 1,000 ft. AGL
- *Helicopter Traffic Patterns*
  - Location: Closed circuit north of runway 26R
  - Pattern Altitude: 500-1,000 ft. AGL
- *Instrument Approach Procedures (lowest minimums)*
  - Runway 26L
    - ILS (straight-in; 1-mi. visibility; 400 ft. MDH)
    - RNAV (GPS) (straight in;  $7/8$ -mi. visibility; 400 ft. MDH)
    - Localizer (straight-in; 1-mi. visibility; 600 ft. MDH)
  - All runways
    - VOR or GPS (circling; 1-mile visibility; 800 ft. MDH))
- *Visual Approach Aids*
  - Airport: Rotating beacon
  - Runway 8R: PAPI (3.76°), REILs
  - Runway 26L: PAPI (3.76°), REILS
- *Operational Restrictions / Noise Abatement Procedures*
  - Runway 8L-26R closed at night
  - Some activity restricted during events at fairgrounds

**APPROACH PROTECTION**

- *Runway Protection Zones (RPZs)*
  - Runway 8R: 1,000 ft. long; all on airport or other co. land
  - Runway 26L: 1,000 ft. long; mostly on co. fairgrounds
  - Runway 8L: 1,000 ft. long; all on airport
  - Runway 26R: 1,000 ft. long; mostly on co. fairgrounds
- *Approach Obstructions*
  - Runway 8R: Hill 3,651 ft. from rwy end (13:1 clear slope)
  - Runway 26L: Road 200 ft. from rwy end (50:1 clear slope to displaced threshold)
  - Runway 8L: Hill 4,750 ft. from rwy end (18:1 clear slope)
  - Runway 26R: Road 540 ft. from rwy end (22:1 clear slope)

**PLANNED FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS**

- *Airfield*
  - Widen Runway 8R-26L to 100 ft.
  - Expand helicopter landing facilities in northwest corner
  - Runway 26L approach lighting system
- *Building Area*
  - Construct additional hangars

**AIRPORT PLANNING DOCUMENTS**

- *Airport Master Plan*
  - Final Report, June 1992; adopted by Co. Bd. of Sups
- *Airport Layout Plan Drawing*
  - Dated June 1992; revised and FAA approved in February 2003; revised April 2010

**DEFINITIONS**


- *AGL:* Above Ground Level
- *GPS:* Global Positioning System
- *MDH:* Minimum Descent Height
- *MIRL:* Medium-Intensity Runway edge Lights
- *MSL:* Mean Sea Level
- *PAPI:* Precision Approach Path Indicator
- *REILs:* Runway End Identifier Lights
- *RPZ:* Runway Protection Zone

Exhibit 2

## Airport Features Summary

### Brackett Field Airport

[This page intentionally blank]





- ABBREVIATIONS**
- APLL Aircraft Parking Limit Line
  - ASOS Automated Surface Observation System
  - BRL Building Restriction Line
  - GS Glide Slope
  - LOC Localizer
  - MIRL Medium Intensity Runway Edge Lights
  - OFZ Obstacle Free Zone
  - PAPI Precision Approach Path Indicator
  - R/W Runway
  - ROFA Runway Object Free Area
  - RPZ Runway Protection Zone
  - RSA Runway Safety Area
  - T/W Taxiway

- NOTES:**
1. All elevations are in feet above mean sea level (MSL).
  2. Final location of relocated remote transmitter to be determined by FAA Airways Facilities Division.
  3. California Coordinate System, Zone 5, NAD 83.
  4. Topography based on aerial mapping conducted December 1999.
  5. Property within RPZ extending beyond airport boundary is owned by the County of Los Angeles.
  6. The airport is part of Lot 38 Rancho San Jose and has not been sectioned. The nearest section corner is over 3 miles southwest of the airport.


**RUNWAY END DATA**

RUNWAY	LATITUDE	EXISTING	ULTIMATE	EXIST. ELEV.	ULT. ELEV.
8R	LATITUDE	34° 5' 30.16" N	SAME	963	SAME
	LONGITUDE	117° 47' 25.81" W	SAME		
26L	LATITUDE	34° 5' 27.49" N	SAME	1,008	SAME
	LONGITUDE	117° 46' 28.36" W	SAME		
8L	LATITUDE	34° 5' 32.51" N	SAME	976	SAME
	LONGITUDE	117° 47' 12.51" W	SAME		
26R	LATITUDE	34° 5' 30.49" N	SAME	1,011	SAME
	LONGITUDE	117° 46' 29.05" W	SAME		



BASED ON 79,922 OBSERVATIONS AT ONTARIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FROM 1990 TO 2000

CONDITION	10.5 KT. X-WIND	13 KT. X-WIND
ALL WEATHER	98.27%	99.05%
LOW VISIBILITY	99.01%	99.29%



**FAA APPROVAL**

FEB 27 2003

Approved  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION  
Western-Pacific Region

By: *[Signature]*  
Supervisor, Standards Section

**RUNWAY DATA**

	RUNWAY 8R-26L		RUNWAY 8L-26R	
	EXISTING	ULTIMATE	EXISTING	ULTIMATE
EFFECTIVE GRADIENT (IN %)	0.931	SAME	0.956	SAME
PAVEMENT STRENGTH (000 LBS)	26(S)	SAME	12.5(S)	SAME
PAVEMENT MATERIAL	ASPH CONC.	SAME	ASPH CONC.	SAME
RUNWAY LIGHTING	MIRL	SAME	NONE	MIRL
RUNWAY MARKING	PRECISION	SAME	BASIC	SAME
INSTRUMENTATION/NAVIGATIONAL AIDS	ILS(26L)	SAME	NONE	SAME
WIND COVERAGE % (13 Kts./15 mph)	99.05	SAME	99.05	SAME
VISUAL AIDS	PAPI, REIL	SAME	NONE	PAPI, REIL(26R)
APPROACH CATEGORY (FAR PART 77)	PREC (B)(L)(S)	SAME	VISUAL(8L-26R)	SAME
APPROACH SURFACES	20:1(8R)	SAME	20:1(8L-26R)	SAME
MAXIMUM ELEVATION ABOVE MSL	50:1(26L)	SAME	50:1(26L)	SAME
RUNWAY LENGTH	1,008'	SAME	1,011'	SAME
RUNWAY WIDTH	4,839'	SAME	3,661'	SAME
RUNWAY SAFETY AREA LENGTH/WIDTH	75'	SAME	100'	75'
	1300'(L)/150'(W)	SAME	240'(L)/120'(W)	SAME

**DEVIATIONS FROM FAA DESIGN STANDARDS**

DESIGN STANDARD	REQUIRED	EXISTING	ACTION
RSA length beyond end of R/W 26L	300 feet	280 feet	To remain
ROFA length beyond end of R/W 26L	300 feet	172 feet	To remain

**AIRPORT DATA**

	EXISTING	ULTIMATE
AIRPORT ELEVATION	1,011' MSL	SAME
AIRPORT REFERENCE POINT (ARP) COORDINATES (NAD 83)	LATITUDE 34° 5' 30.35" N LONGITUDE 117° 46' 53.68" W	SAME
MEAN MAX. TEMP. OF HOTTEST MONTH	91.8°F (Aug.)	SAME
AIRPORT AND TERMINAL NAVAIDS	ILS, VORTAC	SAME
AIRPORT REFERENCE CODE	B-II	SAME
AIRPORT WIND COVERAGE % (13 KNOTS)	99.05	SAME
MISCELLANEOUS FACILITIES	ATCT, BEACON	SAME
DESIGN AIRCRAFT	WIND CONE	SAME
GPS APPROACH	KING AIRCRAFT ILS	SAME
	YES	SAME

**LEGEND**

	EXISTING	ULTIMATE
AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	---	---
AIRPORT BOUNDARY	---	---
AIRPORT REFERENCE POINT (ARP)	⊙	⊙
BUILDINGS	▭	▭
BUILDING RESTRICTION LINE (BRL)	---	---
GROUND CONTOURS	---	---
FENCE	---	---
ROAD/VEHICLE PARKING	---	---
RUNWAY SAFETY AREA	---	---
RUNWAY OBJECT FREE AREA	---	---
OBSTACLE FREE ZONE	---	---

NO.	DATE	REVISION	BY	APP.
1	1/15/03	Proposed west end airport service road added	DPS	TAG
2	10/03/00	Incorporate AIP Proj. No. 3-06-0115-06+07 improvements	DPS	TAG
3	6/92	RSA, ROFA, RPZ REVISED PER AC 150/5300-13, CHG 5	DPS	TAG
4		Original preparation of ALP AIP Proj. No. 3-06-0116-04	DPS	TAG

**AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN**

**BRACKETT FIELD  
LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA**

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**P&D Aviation**  
A Division of  
**P&D Consultants**  
399 Town & Country Rd., 4th Floor  
Orange, CA 92668

DESIGNED: DPS  
DRAWN: AAG

CHECKED: REA  
DATE: JUNE, 1992

SHEET 2 OF 7




C:\Users\870me\appdata\local\temp\AcPublish\7444\Airport Layout Plan-2003.dwg Jun 25, 2013 - 1:06pm



- ABBREVIATIONS**
- APLL Aircraft Parking Limit Line
  - ASOS Automated Surface Observation System
  - BRL Building Restriction Line
  - GS Glide Slope
  - LOC Localizer
  - MIRL Medium Intensity Runway Edge Lights
  - OFZ Obstacle Free Zone
  - PAPI Precision Approach Path Indicator
  - R/W Runway
  - ROFA Runway Object Free Area
  - RPA Runway Protection Area
  - RSA Runway Safety Area
  - T/W Taxiway


- NOTES:**
1. All elevations are in feet above mean sea level (MSL).
  2. Final location of relocated remote transmitter to be determined by FAA Airways Facilities Division.
  3. California Coordinate System, Zone 5, NAD 83.
  4. Topography based on aerial mapping conducted December 1999.
  5. Property within RPZ extending beyond airport boundary is owned by the County of Los Angeles.
  6. The airport is part of Lot 38 Rancho San Jose and has not been sectioned. The nearest section corner is over 3 miles southwest of the airport.

RUNWAY END DATA					
RUNWAY	EXISTING	ULTIMATE	EXIST. ELEV.	ULT. ELEV.	
8R	LATITUDE 34°5'30.16" N LONGITUDE 117°47'25.81" W	SAME	963	SAME	
26L	LATITUDE 34°5'27.49" N LONGITUDE 117°46'28.36" W	SAME	1,008	SAME	
8L	LATITUDE 34°5'32.51" N LONGITUDE 117°47'12.51" W	SAME	976	SAME	
26R	LATITUDE 34°5'30.49" N LONGITUDE 117°46'29.05" W	SAME	1,011	SAME	



- BUILDING KEY**
- 1 Airport Traffic Control Tower
  - 2 Business Park Building
  - 3 FBO
  - 4 Pomona Police Dept.
  - 5 Hangars
  - 6 Fuel Island
  - 7 Terminal Building
  - 8 Portable Hangars
  - 9 Mt. San Antonio College

	RUNWAY 8R-26L		RUNWAY 8L-26R	
	EXISTING	ULTIMATE	EXISTING	ULTIMATE
EFFECTIVE GRADIENT (IN %)	0.931	SAME	0.956	SAME
PAVEMENT STRENGTH (000 LBS)	26(S)	SAME	12-5(S)	SAME
PAVEMENT MATERIAL	ASPH. CONC.	SAME	ASPH. CONC.	SAME
RUNWAY LIGHTING	MIRL	SAME	NONE	MIRL
RUNWAY MARKING	PRECISION	SAME	BASIC	SAME
INSTRUMENTATION/NAVIGATIONAL AIDS	ILS(26L)	SAME	NONE	SAME
WIND COVERAGE % (13 Kts./15 mph)	99.05	SAME	99.05	SAME
VISUAL AIDS	PAPI, REIL	SAME	NONE	PAPI, REIL(26R)
APPROACH CATEGORY (FAR PART 77)	REL(26L)VIS(8)	SAME	VISUAL(8L-26R)	SAME
APPROACH SURFACES	20:1(8R)	SAME	20:1(8L-26R)	SAME
	50:1(26L)	SAME		
MAXIMUM ELEVATION ABOVE MSL	1,008	SAME	1,011	SAME
RUNWAY LENGTH	4,839	SAME	3,661	SAME
RUNWAY WIDTH	75	SAME	75	SAME
RUNWAY SAFETY AREA LENGTH/WIDTH	300(1)/150(1/2)	SAME	249(1)/120(1/2)	SAME



BASED ON 79,922 OBSERVATIONS AT ONTARIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FROM 1990 TO 2000



**WIND COVERAGE**

CONDITION	10.5 KT. X-WIND	13 KT. X-WIND
ALL WEATHER	98.27%	99.05%
LOW VISIBILITY	99.01%	99.29%

FAA APPROVAL

APPROVED BY THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE



The contents of this plan do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the FAA. Acceptance of this document by the FAA does not in any way constitute a commitment on the part of the United States to participate in any development depicted therein nor does it indicate that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable in accordance with appropriate public laws.

DEVIATIONS FROM FAA DESIGN STANDARDS			
DESIGN STANDARD	REQUIRED	EXISTING	ACTION
RSA length beyond end of R/W 26L	300 feet	280 feet	To remain
ROFA length beyond end of R/W 26L	300 feet	172 feet	To remain

AIRPORT DATA		
	EXISTING	ULTIMATE
AIRPORT ELEVATION	1,011' MSL	SAME
AIRPORT REFERENCE POINT (ARP) COORDINATES (NAD 83)	LATITUDE 34°5'30.35" N LONGITUDE 117°46'53.68" W	SAME
MEAN MAX. TEMP. OF HOTTEST MONTH	91.8°F (Aug.)	SAME
AIRPORT AND TERMINAL NAVAIDS	ILS, VORTAC	SAME
AIRPORT REFERENCE CODE	B-II	SAME
AIRPORT WIND COVERAGE % (13 KNOTS)	99.05	SAME
MISCELLANEOUS FACILITIES	ATCT, BEACON	SAME
DESIGN AIRCRAFT	WIND CONE	SAME
GPS APPROACH	KING AIR/CITATION II	SAME
	YES	SAME

LEGEND		
	EXISTING	ULTIMATE
AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	---	---
AIRPORT BOUNDARY	---	---
AIRPORT REFERENCE POINT (ARP)	●	●
BUILDINGS	▭	▭
BUILDING RESTRICTION LINE (BRL)	▨	▨
GROUND CONTOURS	~	~
FENCE	—+—+—+—	—+—+—+—
ROAD/VEHICLE PARKING	▭	▭
RUNWAY SAFETY AREA	▨	▨
RUNWAY OBJECT FREE AREA	▨	▨
OBSTACLE FREE ZONE	▨	▨

NO.	DATE	REVISION	BY	APP
1	04/27/10	Constructed T/W D1 and T/W N Holding Bay	TDR	SRB
2	12/15/08	Proposed Taxiway C1 and Holding Bay	TDR	SRB
3	1/15/03	Proposed west end airport service road added	DPS	TAC
4	10/03/00	Incorporate AIP, Proj. No. 3-06-0116-06-07 Improvements	DPS	TAG
		RSA, ROFA, RPZ REVISED PER AC 150/5300-13, CHG 6		
	6/92	Original preparation of AIP, AIP, Proj. No. 3-06-0116-04	DPS	TAG

**AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN**

BRACKETT FIELD  
LA VERNE, CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**P&D Aviation**  
A Division of  
P&D Consultants  
699 Town & Country Rd., 4th Floor  
Orange, CA 92668

DESIGNED: DPS	CHECKED: REA	SHEET 2 OF 7
DRAWN: AAG	DATE: JUNE, 1992	

C:\Users\870me\AppData\Local\Temp\AcPublish\_7444\Airport Layout Plan-2010.dwg Jun 25, 2013 - 1:06pm




<b>BASED AIRCRAFT<sup>a</sup></b>			<b>RUNWAY USE DISTRIBUTION<sup>a</sup></b>		
	<b>Current Forecast</b>		<b>Current Forecast</b>		
	2012	2035	2014	2035	
<i>Aircraft Type</i>			<i>All aircraft</i>		
Single-Engine	257		Day and Evening Takeoffs & Landings		
Multi-Engine	27	data	Runway 8L	2%	
Turbo-Jet	2	not	Runway 26R	20%	no
Turbo-Prop	4	available	Runway 8R	3%	change
Helicopters	3		Runway 26L	75%	
<i>Total Aircraft</i>	293		<i>All aircraft</i>		
<b>AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS</b>			Night Takeoffs & Landings		
	<b>Current<sup>a</sup> Forecast<sup>b</sup></b>		Runway 8L	0%	
	2014	2035	Runway 26R	0%	no
<i>Total</i>			Runway 8R	1%	change
Annual	102,000	180,000	Runway 26L	99%	
Average Day	279	493	<b>FLIGHT TRACK USAGE<sup>a</sup></b>		
<i>Distribution by Aircraft Type</i>			<b>Current &amp; Future</b>		
Single-Engine	80%	79%	<i>Runways 8L &amp; 26R</i>		
Multi-Engine	9%	7%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arrivals: generally straight in or arrival from the north.</li> <li>▪ Departures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ 8L departures generally are straight out or turn to the north</li> <li>▫ 26R departures straight out or left 45 degree turn towards south</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Touch-and-Goes: No fixed-wing touch-and-go pattern; helicopter closed circuit north of 26R end</li> </ul>		
Turbo-Prop	2%	4%	<i>Runways 8R &amp; 26L</i>		
Turbo-Jet	1%	2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Arrivals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ 26L predominately left traffic with some straight in</li> <li>▫ 8R predominately right traffic with some straight in</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Departures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▫ 26L predominately straight out with some turning left 45 degrees</li> <li>▫ 8R predominately straight out with some turning south</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Touch-and-Goes: Closed circuit south of runway</li> </ul>		
Helicopter	8%	8%			
<i>Distribution by Type of Operation</i>					
Local (touch-and goes)	53%	no			
Itinerant	47%	change			
<b>TIME OF DAY DISTRIBUTION<sup>a</sup></b>					
	<b>Current Forecast</b>				
	2014	2035			
<i>All Aircraft</i>					
Day	95%				
(7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m.)		no			
Evening	3%	change			
(7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.)					
Night	2%				
(10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.)					
<b>Notes</b>					
<sup>a</sup> Source: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Aviation Division staff and Brackett Field Airport contract management					
<sup>b</sup> Source: Mead & Hunt					

Exhibit 4

## Airport Activity Data Summary

Brackett Field Airport

[This page intentionally blank]




**Legend**

- Airport Influence Area
- Runway
- City Limits
- Noise and Overflight**
- 55-60 CNEL
- 60-65 CNEL
- 65-70 CNEL
- 70-75 CNEL
- 75+ CNEL
- Fixed-wing Overflight Envelope
- Helicopter Overflight Envelope
- ➔ East Flow (Winds from East)
- ➔ West Flow (Winds from West)

**Notes**

1. Overflight envelope derived from random observations of Brackett Field radar data obtained from Ontario International Airport WebTrak Internet Flight Tracking System; envelope intended to encompass approximately 80% of observed tracks plus likely tracks associated with increased activity.
2. Noise contours show impacts of projected 180,000 annual operations.

**Brackett Field Airport**  
**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
 (May 2015 Draft)




Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015

Base map source: Los Angeles County (2013).

**Noise and Overflight Factors Map**





**Legend**

- Airport Influence Area
- Runway
- City Limits
- Safety Factors**
- Medium Gen. Aviation Runway Safety Zone
- Short Gen. Aviation Runway Safety Zone
- Arrival Risk Contours
- Departure Risk Contours
  
- 1** Runway Protection Zone
- 2** Inner Approach/Departure Zone
- 3** Inner Turning Zone
- 4** Outer Approach/Departure Zone
- 5** Sideline Zone
- 6** Traffic Pattern Zone

**Notes**

1. Risk contours and safety zones source: California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (2011).
2. Aircraft accident risk intensity contours are derived from nationwide accident location data collected in California Division of Aeronautics database. The contours show relative intensities (highest concentrations) of near-airport accidents in 20% increments. The contour shapes represent a wide range of general aviation airports and have not been modified to reflect the flight tracks for this airport.

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(May 2015 Draft)

Exhibit 6




Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015

Base map source: Los Angeles County (2013)

**Safety Factors Map**





**Legend**

- Airport Influence Area
- Runway
- City Limits
- Natural Hazard Areas**
- Flood Plain
- Seismic - liquefaction
- Seismic - landslide
- Moderate Fire Hazard
- High Fire Hazard
- Very High Fire Hazard

**Notes**

1. Natural Hazards data provided by County of Los Angeles (2013).
2. Per California Civil Code Section 1103, disclosure of airport proximity is required in areas where natural hazards also exist.

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(May 2015 Draft)

Exhibit 7

**Airport Proximity Disclosure Map**

0 3,000 6,000 Feet

Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015

Base map source: Los Angeles County (2013).



**AIRPORT SITE**

- *Location:* San Gabriel Valley of eastern Los Angeles County, 4 miles from San Bernardino County line
- *Nearby Terrain:* Low hills northwest and southwest; mostly flat to northeast and southeast; base of San Gabriel Mountains 4 miles north

**AIRPORT ENVIRONS LAND USE JURISDICTIONS**

*The following jurisdictions are located within or near the Brackett Field ALUCP study area*

- *City of Claremont:* City limits 2.5 miles east of airport (western edge of city in ALUCP study area)
- *City of Covina:* City limits 3.0 miles west (borders ALUCP study area)
- *City of Glendora:* City limits 2.5 miles northwest (small area at 210/57 interchange in ALUCP study area)
- *City of La Verne:* Airport property and area to north and northeast in city limits
- *City of Pomona:* Includes County Fairplex and areas east and southeast of airport
- *City of San Dimas:* Surrounds west end of airport; Bonelli Regional Park in city
- *County of Los Angeles:* Controls several unincorporated islands in various areas around airport
- *County Fairplex:* Not an independent jurisdiction, but controls large property at east end of runways, mostly in City of Pomona and partly in City of La Verne
- *Others:* Cities of Walnut and Diamond Bar 3+ miles to southwest and south (not in airport influence area)

**EXISTING AIRPORT AREA LAND USES**

- *General Character:* Heavily urbanized except for Regional Park and reservoir to southwest and golf course to south
- *Runway Approaches*
  - Runway 8L/R (west): Puddingstone Reservoir 0.3 mile from runway ends; SR 57 1.7 miles; residential beyond
  - Runways 26L/R (east): County Fairplex grounds immediately beyond runway ends; nearest residential uses 0.7 mile east
- *Traffic Patterns*
  - North: Business park adjacent on northeast; residential 0.5 mile northeast and on hill overlooking airport within 0.5 miles on northwest
  - South: Park and golf course on southwest; residential beyond 0.6 mile southeast; I-10 1.2 miles south

**STATUS OF COMMUNITY PLANS**

*The following general plans and specific plans address locations that are within the Brackett Field Airport influence area*

- *City of Claremont*
  - *General Plan*, adopted November 2006
- *City of Covina*
  - *General Plan*, adopted April 2000
- *City of Glendora*
  - *Community Plan 2025*, adopted 2008
- *City of La Verne*
  - *General Plan*, adopted December 1998
  - *Old Town La Verne Specific Plan*, adopted March 2013
  - *Arrow Corridor Specific Plan*, adopted August 2006
- *City of Pomona*
  - *General Plan Update*, adopted March 2014
  - *Pomona Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan*, updated November 2012
  - *Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center Specific Plan*, adopted January 2010
  - *Pomona Corridors Specific Plan*, adopted June 2013
- *City of San Dimas*
  - *General Plan*, 1991
- *County of Los Angeles*
  - *Los Angeles County General Plan*, adopted 1980
  - *Los Angeles County General Plan 2035*, March 2015 Public Draft; adoption anticipated in mid 2015

**PLANNED AIRPORT AREA LAND USES**

*Major development planned for within the Brackett Field Airport influence area includes the following.*

- *General:* Because the airport area is already extensively developed with urban uses, future development will primarily be infill and redevelopment
- *City of La Verne:* Intensive transit-oriented development around Gold Line and Metrolink stations north of Fairplex; includes combination of residential and commercial space, high-rise structures
- *City of Pomona*
  - Pomona Valley Medical Center expansion (1.6 miles southeast of airport)
  - Bonita Ave/Towne Ave high-density residential (2.1 miles east of airport)
- *City of San Dimas:* Increased development intensity along Bonita Avenue in downtown area (1.4 miles northwest of airport)
- *Fairplex:* Promenade connection to rail stations; possible racetrack expansion

Exhibit 8

## Airfield Environs Information

### Brackett Field Airport

**ESTABLISHED AIRPORT COMPATIBILITY MEASURES**

*Community plans of the affected jurisdictions contain the following Brackett Field references and/or airport/land use compatibility policies.*

**City of Claremont**

- *City of Claremont General Plan (2006)*
  - Noise element notes that “Although Brackett Field’s noise contours do not impact Claremont, flight paths cross over the City and Claremont residents occasionally voice concerns over associated noise.”
  - Noise Policy 6-11.7: “Encourage the operators of Cable Airport (City of Upland) and Brackett Field (City of La Verne and the County of Los Angeles) to ensure that the users of the airports know and obey flight-pattern requirements and altitude restrictions.”

**City of Covina**

- *Covina General Plan (April 2000)*
  - Noise Element C-29: “Raise in environmental reviews and oppose any actions implemented by local airports, including, but not limited to, flight path changes in Covina airspace, that noticeably increase the overall level of noise in the community.”

**City of Glendora**

- *Glendora Community Plan 2025*
  - No reference to Brackett Field or airport compatibility

**City of La Verne**

- *La Verne General Plan (1998)*
  - Land Use Policy 11.5a: “Require commercial, office, industrial, private or county development to adhere to the *Brackett Field Master Plan* and be consistent with the settlement agreement between the City of La Verne and Los Angeles County.”
  - Land Use Policy 11.5b: “Require that all privately controlled airport operations or any airport operations not required by the FAA obtain City approval.”
  - Land Use Policy 11.5f: “Support retention and preservation of the existing natural open space in Bonelli Park and demand compliance with our general plan.”
  - Transportation Policy 9.1i: “Support the Airport Land Use Commission’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Brackett Field Airport, which includes policies that: Restrict incompatible development in their vicinity; Protect designated open space in high-risk zones; Restrict structure height in the vicinity of the airport; Recommend buyer awareness programs for surrounding properties; Require sound insulation measures for adjacent development.”
  - Noise Policy 5.1: Maintain noise from Brackett Field at its current level.
  - Community Facilities Policy 7.1a: “Support development of hotel and commercial uses within the Brackett Field Master Plan.”

- *Old Town La Verne Specific Plan (March 2013)*
  - Envisions transit-oriented development adjacent to rail lines at north side of Fairplex
  - No reference to airport compatibility
- *Arrow Corridor Specific Plan (2006)*
  - “The Plan maintains the development patterns of Brackett Field and is consistent with the Brackett Field Master Plan, which allows airport-related and light industrial uses in certain portions of Brackett Field.”
  - “Brackett Airport administrators shall review proposals within the Airport Runway Protection Zone [not mapped], a corridor affected by operations at Brackett Field. Due consideration shall be given to avoid glare and reflection that could interfere with pilots’ ability to see as they approach or leave Brackett Field.”

**City of Pomona**

- *Pomona General Plan (March 2014)*
  - Mentions that CNEL 60 dB contour extends into Fairplex
  - No airport compatibility policies
- *Pomona Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (November 2012)*
  - Does not address airport compatibility
- *Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center Specific Plan (January 2010)*
  - Does not address airport compatibility
- *Pomona Corridors Specific Plan (June 2013)*
  - Does not address airport compatibility
- *Pomona “F” Zone Ordinance*
  - Establishes list of uses permitted outright and ones permitted with a conditional use permit
  - No reference to Brackett Field


**City of San Dimas**

- *San Dimas General Plan (1991)*
  - Noise Element Policy 3.1.3: “The City will monitor the existing operations of Brackett Airport and any plans for future developments. Any actions that increase the level of noise throughout the City will be discouraged. These include flight operations, and flight paths that pass over the City.”

**County of Los Angeles**

- *Los Angeles County General Plan (1980)*
  - No airport compatibility policies
- *Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (March 2015 Public Draft)*
  - Policy LU 6.5: “Ensure airport operation compatibility with adjacent land uses through airport land use plans.”

Exhibit 8, continued



**Legend**

- Airport Influence Area
- Runway
- City Limits

**Notes**

1. See Exhibit 9B for land use legend for this exhibit.
2. Source: Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (2008)

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(May 2015 Draft)

Exhibit 9A

**Existing Land Uses**



**Existing Land Uses (2008)**

**RESIDENTIAL**

-  Residential
-  Single Family Residential
-  Multi-Family Residential
-  Mobile Homes and Trailer Parks
-  Mixed Residential
-  Rural Residential

**COMMERCIAL AND SERVICES**

-  Commercial and Services
-  General Office Use
-  Retail Stores and Commercial Services
-  Other Commercial
-  Public Facilities
-  Special Use Facilities
-  Educational Institutions
-  Military Installations

**INDUSTRIAL**

-  Industrial
-  Light Industrial
-  Heavy Industrial
-  Extraction
-  Wholesaling and Warehousing

**TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, AND UTILITIES**

-  Transportation
-  Communication Facilities
-  Utility Facilities
-  Maintenance Yards

-  Mixed Transportation
-  Mixed Transportation and Utility
-  Mixed Urban
-  Mixed Transportation
-  Under Construction
-  Open Space and Recreation

**AGRICULTURE**

-  Agriculture
-  Cropland and Improved Pasture Land
-  Orchards and Vineyards
-  Nurseries
-  Dairy, Intensive Livestock, and Associated Facilit
-  Poultry Operations
-  Other Agriculture
-  Horse Ranches

**VACANT**

-  Vacant Undifferentiated
-  Abandoned Orchards and Vineyards
-  Beaches (Vacant)
-  Vacant With Limited Improvements

**WATER**

-  Water, Undifferentiated
-  Harbor Water Facilities
-  Marina Water Facilities
-  Water Within a Military Installation
-  (no value given)

**Major Individual Uses**


-  Frank G. Bonelli Regional Park
-  Puddingstone Reservoir
-  Mountain Meadows Golf Course
-  Fairplex
-  University of La Verne
-  Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center
-  California State Polytechnic University - Pomona
-  Children's School

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(May 2015 Draft)

Exhibit 9B





**Legend**

- Runway
- Compatibility Policy Zones
- Airport Influence Area
- City Limits

**City Sphere of Influence**

- (A) San Dimas
- (B) La Verne
- (C) Claremont
- (D) Pomona
- (E) None

**Major Proposed Development**

- (1) La Verne Gold Line and Metrolink station area transit-oriented development
- (2) Fairplex transit-oriented development and promenade
- (3) University of La Verne and La Verne Old Town
- (4) University of La Verne West Campus & Joint City/ULV Property
- (5) Downtown San Dimas

**Notes**

1. See Exhibit 11a for Land Use Legend for this Exhibit.
2. Zoning designations shown for La Verne and San Dimas; general plan land use designations not available as GIS data
3. Claremont general plan and zoning land use designations not available as GIS data
4. Los Angeles County general plan land use designations shown for unincorporated area inside city spheres of influence.

**Brackett Field Airport**

**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
(Draft: 11/9/2015)

Exhibit 10A

**General Plan Land Uses**

Prepared By Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2015.

Base map source: Los Angeles County 2013.



**Pomona General Plan (2011)**

-  Low Density Residential
-  Medium Density Residential
-  High Density Residential
-  Single Family Residence
-  Administrative Professional
-  Convenience Commercial
-  General Commercial
-  Industrial
-  Institutional
-  Open Space
-  Specific Plan

**Glendora General Plan (2013)**

-  Hillside Very Low Density
-  Low Density
-  Low/Medium Density
-  Medium Density
-  Medium/High Density
-  High Density
-  General Commercial
-  Regional Commercial
-  Village Mixed Use
-  Light Industrial
-  General Industrial
-  Conservation Open Space
-  Open Space
-  Civic/Institutional
-  Route 66 Specific Plan
-  Utility and Flood Control
-  Railroad

**San Dimas Zoning (2012)**

-  Single Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)
-  Single Family (SF)
-  Single Family Hillside (SF-H)
-  Single Family Agriculture (SF-A)
-  Mobile Home Park (MH-P)
-  Multiple Family (MF)
-  Multiple Family Duplex (MF-D)
-  Commercial Neighborhood (CN)
-  Commercial Highway (CH)
-  Administrative Professional (AP)
-  Creative Growth (CG)
-  Light Manufacturing (M-1)
-  Light Agriculture (AL)
-  Public/Semi-Public (PS)
-  Open Space (OS)
-  Watershed (W)
-  Specific Plan (SP)

**L.A. County General Plan (2012)**

-  1 - Low Density Residential (1 to 6 du/ac)
-  C - Major Commercial
-  I - Major Industrial
-  O - Open Space
-  P - Public and Semi-Public Facilities
-  R - Non-Urban
-  TC - Transportation Corridor

**La Verne Zoning (1998)**

-  Agriculture
-  Commercial
-  Industrial
-  Institutional
-  Official
-  Residential

**Brackett Field Airport**  
**Land Use Compatibility Plan**  
 (May 2015 Draft)

Exhibit 10B

