

## Staff Report to the ALUC ALUCP Project

Prepared by Tangella Corp.  
7/9/09

The ALUCP Public Draft presentations, in each airport community, were completed on June 6. Below is an attendance report. The “Public Present” is based on a headcount and does not include ALUC, County Staff or BoS members.

<b>Airport</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Public Present</b>	<b>ALUC Present</b>	<b>BoS Present</b>
Hyampom	6/08/09	Community Hall	21		
Hayfork	6/14/09	Fairgrounds Dining Hall	18	Jim Jungwirth	
Ruth	6/15/09	RLCSD Community Hall	2	Ray Bushman	
Trinity Center	6/17/09	IIOOF Hall	18	Keith Groves Hal Pflueger Jack Razetto	Judy Pflueger
Weaverville	6/18/09	Library	9	Donna Harmon Jack Razetto	

Paraphrased questions and comments raised by the public:

1. How will zoning be handled when a compatibility zone boundary splits a parcel?  
Who will pay for the land survey to determine where the boundary is? (Hayfork)

Discussion: Chapter 2, Policy 9.6 discusses the situation in which a parcel is divided by a zone boundary. The zone dimensions are specified in Policy 7.4 with any exceptions specified in Chapter 3. Safety and noise considerations have led the ALUC to the current zone definitions, but there is no absolute change in risk or noise at the zone boundaries.

As with other zoning district overlays, the parcel owner is responsible for having the property surveyed to determine the parcel and zone boundaries.

Staff recommendation: We suggest leaving Policy 9.6 as written and not specify any requirements for land surveys. The policy, as written, allows property owners to discuss various project options with the Planning and ALUC staffs.

2. What kinds of “birds” and “uses” are referenced in “hazards to aviation”? (Hayfork)

Issue: The property owner would like a definitive list of “agricultural uses” and types of birds that the ALUCP wants to discourage (Chapter 2, Policy 8.7.) He wants the limitations in writing to eliminate discretionary rulings.

Discussion: FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, *Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On Or Near Airports*, recommends against anything that attracts large flocks of birds. The agricultural attractants the FAA identifies (AC Section 2-6) include certain livestock production operations, aquaculture, and alternative uses of agricultural land.

The livestock operations the FAA discourages within 5,000 feet of a runway include feedlots, dairy operations, hog or chicken production facilities, or egg laying operations. Aquaculture involves outdoor production of fish (*e.g.*, catfish or trout production). Alternative uses include seasonal uses, such as hunting when land is not used for crop production.

In our rural communities, agriculture is foundational to the local economy. Putting restrictions on land use can discourage agriculture that contributes to the communities. The tradeoff of having no restrictions is the safety of the public in flight and on the ground near the airport in the event of a bird strike on an aircraft in flight.

Staff recommendation: It is recommended that Policy 8.7 be amended as follows:

### **8.7 Wildlife Compatibility**

**Policy objective:** To minimize the creation of wildlife attractions near airports.

Any proposed use that creates an increased attraction for large flocks of birds is discouraged. (Refer to FAA Order 5200.5A, Waste Disposal Sites on or Near Airports and Advisory Circular 150/5200-33, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports.)

#### **8.7.1 Waste Disposal Landfills**

Landfills are prohibited within 5,000 feet of any runway.

#### **8.7.2 Agricultural Uses**

There is no limitation on types of crops.

Confined livestock operations (*i.e.*, feedlots, dairy operations, hog or chicken production facilities, or egg laying operations) are prohibited in Zones A, B1, B2 and C.

### 8.7.3 Water Impoundments

(The text of this section remains unchanged. The section is simply renumbered 8.7.3.)

3. Do restrictions against “glare” mean we cannot have solar panels? (Hayfork)

Discussion: The purpose of the restriction on glare is to prevent an intense reflection from a manmade object on the ground from blinding or interfering with a pilot’s ability to safely operate the aircraft. This restriction is intended to prevent structures from having highly reflective roofs, and the placement of other objects, such as solar panels that are highly reflective, in a compatibility zone. Non-reflective roofs, and solar panels constructed or coated with non-reflective materials are acceptable.

Staff recommendation: Add the following definition to the ALUCP Appendix G, *Glossary*:

**Glare** – As used in this ALUCP, glare refers to the reflection of light from objects on the ground that can blind or interfere with pilot operations in flight. Objects that have non-glare coloring or coatings that significantly reduce reflectivity are not considered to produce glare.

4. What is “ground level” for height restriction determination? “What if I build a mound to put my structure on?” (Hayfork)

Issue: The property owner would like a clear definition of the term to eliminate discretionary rulings.

Discussion: The concept applied here will be similar to the concept applied by Planning to any project. The *undisturbed ground level* before any grading or other project work begins is the ground level used to determine heights of objects in most cases. Policy 8.5 specifies height restrictions, and the restrictions are summarized in the Table 2-3, *Primary Compatibility Criteria*. The following definition appears in the ALUCP Appendix G, *Glossary*:

**Height** – For the purpose of determining consistency with height limits in all airport zones shown on an Airport Compatibility Zone Map, height shall be measured as the highest point of a structure or tree measured from the highest point of undisturbed ground immediately adjacent to the object unless otherwise specified.

Staff recommendation: It is not clear that providing further guidance in the policies will clarify the meaning. Undoubtedly cases can be constructed that the policy will not perfectly describe. Therefore, it is recommended that the policies be left as written and that Planning and the ALUC handle exceptional cases through the variance process.

5. Why not shrink the AIA on the south side of Hayfork Airport? (Hayfork)

Issue: The homeowner does not see the need for any restrictions in an area where there no traffic pattern and due to the terrain to the south of the airport, the AIA seems excessive.

Discussion: The AIA is intended to provide buyer awareness that there is an airport in the Hayfork Valley. Properties to the south of the airport are subject to noise and occasional overflight from the south. While most traffic is to the north due to terrain, the valley is wide enough to allow pattern entry from the south. Crosswind entries are not uncommon, and such pattern entries entail overflight south of the airport.

Staff recommendation: The AIA does not impose building, density, intensity or height restrictions. Therefore, it is recommended that the standard AIA be applied.

6. At Trinity Center Airport, please redefine Zone B1 to exclude all R-1 parcels on the east side of Lakeview Drive. (Trinity Center)

Issue: The homeowner's request is based upon wanting her property to be treated the same as the majority of parcels along Lakeview Drive, and her feeling that being in Zone B1 will have a negative impact on the value of her property due to a buyer's perception. The homeowner is also concerned that pilots will view Zone B1 as permission to overfly the houses.

Discussion: Zone B1 is intended to provide an increased measure of protection alongside the final approach course leading to touchdown. Aircraft are not always aligned with the runway close in on final approach. This is the reason that Zones B1 and B2 exist on the side of the runway opposite to the traffic pattern. In the case of Trinity Center airport, the three parcels partially in Zone B1 have residences on them, and are thus subject to the Existing Use rules. That is, no impact exists on those property owners even if they need to reconstruct their residences or alter them under the Reconstruction policies. Furthermore, if future owners of those parcels petition the county to reclassify those parcels for other than R-1 uses, then the stricter rules of Zone B1 *should* likely be applied. With respect to pilots using Zone B1 to determine areas of potential overflight, this is extremely unlikely. It is not common practice for pilots to review ALUCPs, nor to infer any particular meaning from compatibility zones.

Staff recommendation: It is recommended that the zones be applied as specified in the existing draft ALUCP. Due to Existing Use policy, there is no practical limitation on the property owners. Alternatively, the ALUC could choose to alter the shape of Zone B1 to follow the airport property line from the point where the radius intersects the property line to Lakeview Drive, and then follow the boundary of Lakeview drive westerly until that line intersects the radius. This would exclude the R-1 parcels from Zone B1.

7. Consider renaming Zone B2 off the north end of Weaverville Airport to reflect its purpose: it is not a “Turning Area” or “Extended Approach/Departure Area” since there should be no approaches or departures in that area. Furthermore, why restrict homes to two stories given that the East Weaver area is lower than the airport elevation? Perhaps create a “B3” zone for this unique area. (Weaverville)

Issue: The homeowner feels that being in a zone labeled as a turning or approach area conveys a negative impression to a future buyer since there should be no landings or takeoffs over the area. He would like a new zone created that correctly labels the zone for its use, *e.g.*, an “overrun area” as a new zone with criteria that better reflects the safety issues.

Discussion: Zone B2 is indeed an Extended Departure Area for the cases in which an aircraft on approach to Runway 36 performs a go-around maneuver. While pilots are discouraged from executing low-altitude go-arounds, it may be necessary in the case of a runway incursion or other emergency that requires an aborted landing. In these cases, aircraft will be attempting to climb out over the area north of the airport, overflying Zones B1 and B2 during climb-out. Regarding the heights of structures, most of the area inside Zone B2 is at or above runway elevation. A portion of the southeast area of Zone B1 is below runway elevation, and those parcels may be considered for height variances on a project by project basis.

Staff recommendation: It is recommended that the standard Zones B1 and B2 definitions be applied north of the airport. There is a small number of parcels that may be considered for higher structures, but most of those few lots already have residences on them. It does not appear warranted to construct a new zone definition.