

**Final Placer County Airport Land Use
Compatibility Plans
For Auburn Municipal, Blue Canyon
and Lincoln Regional Airports
Addendum #1**

Final Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans For Auburn Municipal, Blue Canyon and Lincoln Regional Airports

Addendum #1

February 26, 2014

This addendum contains the proposed revisions to the *Draft Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)* dated November 2013. Additions are shown underlined; deletions in ~~strikeout~~. Only substantive changes are identified below; if necessary, minor typographical corrections also may be made prior to publication of the final document. After adoption of the *Compatibility Plan* by the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA), acting in its capacity as the Placer County Airport Land Use Commission, all revisions will be incorporated into the *ALUCP* and a final document will be prepared and posted on PCTPA website (www.pctpa.net).

General

- Terms of Art—words or phrases that have special meaning in the context of airport land use compatibility planning—are italicized throughout document.
- Acronyms—for example, Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) or Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)—applied throughout document.
- Floor Area Ratio is spelled out rather than using the acronym of “FAR” as this acronym is used elsewhere in the document to refer to Federal Aviation Regulations.

Chapter 1, Introductions

Page 1-2, modify paragraph as follows:

- Sacramento International Airport and McClellan Field in Sacramento County and Beale Air Force Base in Yuba County. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) functions as the *ALUC* for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties in accordance with the designated body provisions of Public Utilities Code Section 21670.1. Though also members part of SACOG, the counties of Placer and El Dorado have their own *ALUCs*.

Page 1-2 and 1-3, ALUC Powers and Duties, add footnote sourcing quoted text:

- Footnote 4, Public Utilities Code Section 21670(a) (2).

Page 1-3, ALUC Limitations, add footnote sourcing quoted text:

- Footnote 5, Public Utilities Code Section 21674(a).
- Footnote 6, Public Utilities Code Section 21674(e).

Page 1-3, ALUCP Guidelines, modify paragraph and add footnote as follows:

- With respect to airport land use compatibility criteria, the statutes say little however. Instead, a section of the law enacted in 1994 refers to another document, the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook) published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics. Specifically, the statutes say that, when preparing compatibility plans for individual airports, designated bodies functioning as ALUCs, such as the PCTPA functioning as the PCALUC, shall rely upon the compatibility information contained “shall be guided by information”⁷ in the Handbook. 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 *ALUCP* rely upon the guidance provided by the current edition of the *Handbook* (October 2011). The October 2011 edition of the *Handbook* is available for downloading from the Division of Aeronautics web site (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 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. ~~This statute~~ The Public Resources Code requires lead agencies to use the *Handbook* as “a technical resource” when preparing CEQA documents assessing airport-related noise and safety impacts of projects located in the vicinity of airports.¹

- Footnote 7, Public Utilities Code Section 21674.7(a).

Page 1-4, ALUCP Relationship to Airport Master Plans, modify paragraph as follows:

- ~~Airport land use compatibility plans~~ ALUCPs are distinct from airport master plans, airport layout plans and other types of airport development plans, but they are closely connected to them. An airport layout plan is a drawing showing existing facilities and planned improvements. Airport Mmaster plans primarily address on-airport issues. The purpose of airport master plans is to assess the demand for airport facilities and to guide the development necessary to meet those demands. A typical airport master plan includes an airport layout plan, but also provides textual background data, a discussion of forecasts, and an examination of alternatives along with a detailed description of the proposed development. Airport layout plans and airport master plans are prepared for and adopted by the entity that owns and/or operates the airport. Most large, publicly owned airports have an airport master plan, but many smaller or private airports do not.

Page 1-4, ALUCP Airport Activity Forecasts, modify quoted text and subsequent paragraph as follows:

- “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.” (Handbook, p. 3-5.)

- ~~“...most airports presumably will remain in operation for more than 20 years. This factor combined with the characteristic uncertainty of forecasting suggests that, for the purpose of airport land use compatibility planning, using a high 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.”~~

~~The caveat to this methodology, as also stated in the Handbook, is that “activity projections must also be reasonable.” Chapters 7 through 9 describe the activity forecasts upon which the ALUCPs for Au-burn Municipal, Blue Canyon and Lincoln Regional Airports are based.~~

Page 1-6, General Plan Consistency, add footnote for following reference:

- As noted above, state law requires each local agency having jurisdiction over land uses within an ALUC’s planning area to modify its general plan and any affected specific plans to be consistent with the compatibility plan. The law says that the local agency must take this action within 180 days of when the ALUC adopts or amends its plan.¹⁵ The only other course of action available to local agencies is to overrule the ALUC using the process outlined in the next section.
- Footnote 15, Government Code Section 65302.3(b).

Page 1-7, modify Footnote 17 as follows:

- See Public Utilities Code Sections 21678 and, ~~with slightly different wording,~~ 21675.1(f).

Page 1-8, Project Referrals, modify paragraph as follows:

- In addition to the types of land use actions for which referral to the ALUC is mandatory in accordance with state law—adoption or amendment of general plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, or building codes affecting land within an airport influence aArea—the ALUCP specifies other land use projects that either must or should be submitted for review. These “major land use actions” are defined in Chapter 2. Beginning when the ALUCP ~~with when this plan~~ is adopted by the ALUC and continuing until such time as local jurisdictions have made the necessary modifications to their general plans, all of these major land use actions are to be referred to the commission for review. After local agencies have made their general plans consistent with the ALUCP, the ALUC requests that these major actions continue to be submitted on a voluntary basis. These procedures must be indicated in the local jurisdiction’s general plan or other implementing policy document in order for the general plan to be considered fully consistent with the ALUCP.

Page 1-11, ALUCP Adoption Process, modify paragraph as follows:

- The Initial Study and associated Negative Declarations associated with the ALUCP for each airport will be circulated for a 45-day public review period that will extend from December ~~16~~2, 2013 through January ~~31~~26, 2014. Written comments provided on the ALUCP and associated CEQA document during this timeframe will be used to guide a final set of revisions to the draft ALUCP ~~plan~~.

Chapter 2, Procedural Policies

Page 2-6, modify Policy 2.2.6(b) as follows:

- The County of Placer, each of the affected cities municipalities and any future city shall:

Page 2-13, modify Policy 2.7.3(a) as follows:

- Qualifying Criteria: An Existing Land Use is one that either physically exists or for which Local Agency commitments to the proposal have been obtained in one or more of the following manners and is considered by the ALUC to have a vested right:

Chapter 3, Countywide Compatibility Policies

Page 3-18, modify Policy 3.4.9(b)(2) as follows:

- In Compatibility Zone D, facilities are allowed only if alternative sites outside Zone D would not serve the intended function.

Page 3-18, modify Policy 3.7.4(c) as follows:

- Reconstruction under Paragraphs (a) or (b) above:
 - Must have a permit deemed complete by the Local Agency within the time frame established by that agency.
 - Shall incorporate sound attenuation features to the extent required by Policy 3.3.2.
 - Shall require dedication of an Avigation Easement to the jurisdiction owning the Airport if required under Policy 3.7.1.
 - Shall record an overflight notification in the chain of title of the property if required by Policy 3.6.1.
 - Shall comply with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 requirements (see Section 3.5).

Chapter 4, Auburn Municipal Airport Compatibility Policies and Maps

Page 4-1, modify Policy 4.1.3 as follows:

- Compatibility Policy Map: The Compatibility Zones for Auburn Municipal Airport are presented in Map AUB-4A and the map is to be used in conjunction with the criteria set forth in Table AUB-4A, Basic Compatibility Criteria and the additional policies listed in Section 4.2.3 of this Chapter.

Page 4-3, modify Policy 4.2.2(d) as follows:

- Compatibility Zone C1 covers the extended approach/departure corridor and also includes land beneath the primary traffic pattern. This zone is affected by moderate degrees of both noise and risk. Cumulative noise levels exceed CNEL 55 dB in portions of Compatibility Zone C1 and noise from individual aircraft operations is disruptive to Noise-Sensitive Land Uses. Aircraft overfly this area at or below the traffic

pattern altitude of 1,000 feet above the ~~runway~~ airport elevation. According to the data presented in the Caltrans Handbook, 40% to 50% of off-runway, airport-related, general aviation aircraft accidents occur within Compatibility Zones B1 and C1 for comparable airports. Compatibility Zone C1 also encompasses the remaining portions of Handbook Safety Zones 3 and 4 and the inner portions of Zone 6. Portions of Compatibility Zone C1 lie beneath the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 transitional surface airspace — restrictions may be required on tall objects (ones greater than 100 feet high). Zone C1 includes the majority of the CNEL 55 dB contour plus locations beneath the airport's only straight-in instrument approach procedure (Runway 7) and the predominantly used (south-side) traffic pattern for visual procedures. The edges of these areas fall close to well-defined roads and property lines, thus for convenience the zone boundaries are shown on these geographic features.

- Compatibility Zone C2 encompasses areas routinely overflowed by aircraft approaching and departing the Airport, but less frequently or at higher altitudes than the areas within Compatibility Zone C1. Zone C2 contains the north-side traffic pattern plus additional areas on the south-side of the Airport where aircraft fly wide traffic patterns and within the common arrival and departure corridor to the west. Compatibility Zone C2 also encompasses the outer portions of Handbook Safety Zone 6 and remaining portions of the CNEL 55 dB contour. Annoyance associated with aircraft overflights is the major concern within Compatibility Zone C2 as aircraft typically overfly these areas at an altitude of 1,000 to 1,500 feet above ground level on visual approaches or as low as 601 feet above the airport elevation under when utilizing the circle to land procedure. Noise from individual aircraft overflights may adversely affect certain land uses. Safety is a concern only with regard to uses involving high concentrations of people and particularly Risk-Sensitive Land Uses such as schools and hospitals.

Chapter 5, Blue Canyon Airport Compatibility Policies and Maps

Page 5-1, modify Policy 5.2.1 as follows:

- Airport Runway Configuration Assumptions: Map BLU-5A and Map BLU-5B are based up-on the Blue Canyon Airport runway configuration indicated in the Airport Layout Plan drawing dated June 2003 submitted by the ~~city~~ County and approved by the ~~Federal Aviation Administration~~ Caltrans Division of Aeronautics for State permitting purposes. The runway configuration and ~~types of~~ visual approaches shown in ~~these plans~~ the Airport Layout Plan are the same as the existing conditions.

Chapter 6, Lincoln Regional Airport Compatibility Policies and Maps

Page 6-2, modify Policy 6.2.2(a) as follows:

- Compatibility Zone A includes the Airport runways and immediately adjacent areas wherein uses are restricted to aeronautical functions in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) standards and state guidance provided in the 2011 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook). Compatibility Zone A encompasses the area adjacent to and at the ends of the future runway system, which includes the proposed northerly extension of the primary runway and future

parallel runway). The width is based upon FAR Part 77 primary surface requirements as shown on the current Lincoln Regional Airport Airspace Protection Surfaces Map (LIN-6B). The length contains the existing and future runway protection zone (RPZ) of each runway as depicted in the 2008 Airport Layout Plan. RPZ dimensions are defined by FAA airport design standards and take into account the runway approach type and the type of aircraft the runway is intended to accommodate. In terms of risk, Compatibility Zone A encompasses the areas covered by the generic Safety Zone 1 provided in the 2011 Handbook. Compatibility Zone A is characterized as an area exposed to high risk of an aircraft accident as well as subject to high aircraft noise levels. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) exceeds 65 dB within much of Compatibility Zone A.

Page 6-2, modify Policy 6.2.2(b) third bullet as follows:

- Majority of operations (85%) are conducted from north to south. Aircraft are anticipated to reach sufficient altitude before reaching Highway 65 thus minimizing safety hazards and overflight annoyance. The proposed runway extension will also enable departing aircraft to be at a higher altitude over the communities south of Highway 65.

Page 6-3, modify Policy 6.2.2(c) as follows:

- Compatibility Zone B2 consists of two areas adjacent to Compatibility Zone A, one on each side of the runways. The length of the zone is based on the length of the future runways. The length on the east side is predicated on the city's adoption of a policy which will ~~require~~ request aircraft approaching and departing the future runway to avoid turns closer than the ends of the primary runway. The width of the zone takes into account the future runway and is set so as to generally contain the future CNEL 60 dB contour. Sideline aircraft noise is the key factor in this area, both cumulative and single-event. Run-up noise may also be a concern in some locations. Risk is also a factor, but less so than in Compatibility Zone B1. The zone also encompasses Handbook Safety Zone 5. Height restrictions may be required for airspace protection purposes.

Page 6-4, delete Policy 6.2.3(a) as follows:

- ~~The City of Lincoln shall adopt a policy which will require aircraft approaching and departing the future parallel runway to avoid turns closer than the ends of the primary runway.~~

Chapter 7, Background Data: Auburn Municipal Airport and Environs

Page 7-2, Airfield Configuration, add following paragraph:

- The 2007 master plan includes a substantial analysis of extending the existing runway further to the west, east or combination of both. The intention was to address the future needs of the Airport by extending the current 3,700 foot long runway to an optimal 4,280 feet. The Auburn City Council ultimately did not include that extension in the 2007 master plan as it did not seem economically feasible at the time. The City is initiating a master plan update in 2014 to reassess the feasibility of extending the existing runway to accommodate slightly larger planes and meet the future avia-

tion needs for the region. However, until such time as the contemplated runway extension is represented in a master plan adopted for the airport by the City, this feature is not incorporated into the ALUC's ALUCP for the Airport.

Page 7-2, Aircraft Traffic Patterns, add following paragraph:

- The airport has one instrument approach procedure, RNAV (GPS) RWY 7. This approach allows for a straight in approach to Runway 7 or a circling approach to either Runway 7 or 25. The straight in procedure to Runway 7 has three categories and associated visibility minimums: 1) visibility minimums of 1¼ mile with a decision height of 315 feet above touchdown zone elevation, or 2) 1¾ mile visibility minimums with a decision height of 435 feet above touchdown zone elevation, or 3) Visibility minimums of 1-mile with a decision height of 567 feet above touchdown zone elevation. The circling approach has visibility minimums as low as 1-mile and a decision height of 601 feet above airport elevation. Aircraft utilizing the circling approach may circle the airport any distance desired so long as the runway can be seen at a distance no closer than 1 mile from the runway. The circling approach is not permitted at night.

Page 7-3, Surrounding Land Uses, modify paragraph as follows:

- Surrounding lands contain a mixture of residential, industrial, and commercial uses and open space. The most intensive development is to the west along Grass Valley Highway (State Highway 49), three-quarters of a mile west of the runway end. Various commercial uses, hospital and a mobile home park lie along the highway corridor. Major uses to the south include a reservoir and a golf course. Areas to the north and east consist mostly of rural residential uses, convalescent home and some undeveloped land. An aqueduct, owned and operated by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, traverses the eastern side of the airport property. Schools, places of worship, and other public facilities also exist within the airport environs. Planned land uses reflect existing land use patterns.

Facing Page 7-6, Exhibits 7D and 7E, modify Note 1 as follows:

- Source: Auburn Municipal Airport Master Plan, adopted July ~~2007~~ 2004.

Page 7-7, Exhibit 7F, Existing Airport Area Land Uses, modify as follows:

- Traffic Pattern
 - Southwest: Mixed commercial, office and light industrial along Hwy ~~49~~ 46; residential beyond
 - South: Park/reservoir; golf course; residential, places of worship, schools south of Bell Road
 - Southeast, North & Northeast: Rural residential

Chapter 8, Background Data: Blue Canyon Airport and Environs

Facing Page 8-4, Exhibit 8B, Airport Layout Plan, modify as follows:

- Replace the December 2000 Airport Layout Plan with the current Airport Layout Plan approved by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics in June 2003.

Appendix H, Comparison Between Old and New ALUC Plans

Page H-6 through H-12, Exhibits H1 through H3, modify as follows:

- Reformat information in third column of tables so that each zone is on its own line.
- Insert blank pages on facing pages of tables and update page numbers accordingly.
- Remove duplicate table H3.
- Insert Figures H1 and H2 as they were omitted from draft document.