

## AIRPORT COMPATIBILITY PLANNING

### Introduction

The California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code, Section 21670 et seq.) requires that an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Compatibility Plan) be prepared for all public-use airports in the state to:

*“protect the public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring 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 land uses.”*

State law also requires local land use plans and individual development proposals to be consistent with policies set forth in Compatibility Plans. Compatibility Plans must have 20-year horizons, taking into consideration regional growth projections and future airport expansion plans that would increase airport activity and associated impacts. Compatibility Plans are tailored to each airport’s specific land use impacts and issues. The statutes also require that local jurisdictions preparing Compatibility Plans “rely upon” the compatibility guidance provided by the California *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* published by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics in January 2002.

### Five-Step Compatibility Planning Process

The development of the *Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* followed this five-step process.

➔ **Step 1: Initiate Process and Gather Data**

Conduct preliminary work needed to initiate the compatibility planning process such as identifying the responsibilities of the City of Ontario in preparing the *Compatibility Plan*, gathering pertinent airport data such as an airport master plan or airport layout plan, and identifying/notifying the different stakeholders.

➔ **Step 2: Delineate the Airport Influence Area**

Define the areas that need to be considered for airport land use compatibility planning by examining the four factors of compatibility that include safety, noise, airspace protection and overflight consistent with the California *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook)*.

➔ **Step 3: Identify Compatibility Concerns**

Examine the level of compatibility in the community by evaluating existing land uses and land use plans against compatibility concerns.

➔ **Step 4: Develop Compatibility Policies**

Examine the various policies and regulatory documents available (e.g. California *Handbook*, Public Utilities Code, FAA guidance) to guide in the development of compatibility policies that will be part of the airport land use compatibility plan.

### → Step 5: Establish Implementation Strategies

Identify and adopt strategies for implementing the compatibility plan, making local land use plans consistent with the *Compatibility Plan* and processing consistency reviews of future development proposals.

## THE ONT COMPATIBILITY PLAN

### Function of the Compatibility Plan

The basic function of the *Compatibility Plan* for Ontario International Airport (ONT) is to promote compatibility between ONT and the land uses that surround it. As required by state law, the *Compatibility Plan* provides guidance to affected local jurisdictions with regard to airport land use compatibility matters involving ONT. The *Compatibility Plan* is separate and distinct from the jurisdictions' other land use policy documents—their general plans, specific plans, and zoning ordinances—yet all of the documents are expected to be made consistent with each other through incorporation of the compatibility policies into their land use policy documents.

The main objective of the *Compatibility Plan* is to avoid future compatibility conflicts rather than to remedy existing incompatibilities. Also, the *Compatibility Plan* is aimed at addressing future land uses and development, not airport activity. The *Compatibility Plan* does not place any restrictions on the present and future role, configuration, or use of the airport.

### Airport Influence Area

The central component of this *Compatibility Plan* is the set of procedural and compatibility policies outlined in Chapter 2. These policies set limits on future land uses and development near the airport in response to noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts of current and future airport activity. The geographic extent of these four types of impacts together constitutes the ONT Airport Influence Area (AIA). The ONT AIA encompasses lands within parts of San Bernardino, Riverside and Los Angeles Counties. However, this *Compatibility Plan* applies only to jurisdictions within San Bernardino County; specifically, the County of San Bernardino and the Cities of Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, and Upland, together with any special district, community college district, or school district that exists or may be established or expanded into the AIA. The *Compatibility Plan* does not apply to state-owned, federal or tribal lands.

**Note:** The compatibility policies set forth herein, specifically in Chapter 2, are relevant to Los Angeles and Riverside County jurisdictions and Los Angeles and Riverside County Airport Land Use Commissions. These agencies are encouraged to adopt these policies for their portions of the ONT AIA, but are not required to.

The *Compatibility Plan* has been prepared in coordination with the applicable jurisdictions listed above and representatives of Caltrans Division of Aeronautics and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Los Angeles Airports District Office.

### Effective Date and Adoption of the Compatibility Plan

The provisions of the *Compatibility Plan* will take effect upon the plan's adoption by the City of Ontario. Other affected entities within San Bernardino County have options as to how to incorporate pertinent *Compatibility Plan* provisions into their respective local plans and policies or to dispute portions of the plan, but they cannot simply opt out of the process (Public Utilities Code Section 21670.1 (c)).

## THE “ALTERNATIVE PROCESS”

### State Law Requirements

In most counties, the responsibility for the preparation and adoption of compatibility plans falls to the county airport land use commission (ALUC). State law also provides for what is generally referred to as an “Alternative Process” wherein a county does not have to form an ALUC and the required compatibility planning responsibilities fall to local jurisdictions. San Bernardino County and its cities elected to follow the Alternative Process when this option became available as a result of the 1994 legislation (Assembly Bill 2831).

Specific requirements for implementation of the Alternative Process are set forth in Public Utilities Code Section 21670.1(c)(2) as follows:

“...[the] county and the appropriate affected cities having jurisdiction over an airport, subject to the review and approval by the Division of Aeronautics of the department, shall do all of the following:

- (A) Adopt processes for the preparation, adoption, and amendment of the airport land use compatibility plan for each airport that is served by a scheduled airline or operated for the benefit of the general public.
- (B) Adopt processes for the notification of the general public, landowners, interested groups, and other public agencies regarding the preparation, adoption, and amendment of the airport land use compatibility plans.
- (C) Adopt processes for the mediation of disputes arising from the preparation, adoption, and amendment of the airport land use compatibility plans.
- (D) Adopt processes for the amendment of general and specific plans to be consistent with the airport land use compatibility plans.
- (E) Designate the agency that shall be responsible for the preparation, adoption, and amendment of each airport land use compatibility plan.”

Paragraph (3) of Section 21670.1(c) goes on to say that:

“The Division of Aeronautics of the department shall review the processes adopted pursuant to paragraph (2), and shall approve the processes if the division determines that the processes are consistent with the procedure required by this article and will do all of the following:

- (A) Result in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans within a reasonable amount of time.
- (B) Rely on the height, use, noise, safety, and density criteria that are compatible with airport operations, as established by this article, and referred to as the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, published by the division, and any applicable federal aviation regulations, including, but not limited to, Part 77 (commencing with Section 77.1) of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
- (C) Provide adequate opportunities for notice to, review of, and comment by the general public, landowners, interested groups, and other public agencies.”

### San Bernardino County Alternative Process

Use of the Alternative Process within San Bernardino County was established in 1995 by resolutions of the County Board of Supervisors and the city councils of cities affected by airports. Specifically the Ontario City Council adopted the Alternative Process through Resolution No. 95-34 utilizing the Airport Environs Section of the General Plan as the basis for airport land use compatibility planning (see Appendix F). The California Division of Aeronautics approved the San Bernardino County

Alternative Process in 1996. The approval of the Alternative Process designated the City of Ontario as the local jurisdiction responsible for leading the compatibility planning process for ONT.

The policies in Chapter 2 of this *Compatibility Plan* clarify and amend the process previously established by Ontario City Council Resolution No. 95-34 to include participation by the other agencies within San Bernardino County having jurisdiction over portions of the AIA established by this *Compatibility Plan*. Participation by these agencies will be accomplished through the ONT Inter-Agency Notification Process and creation of a Mediation Board. The roles and responsibilities of the participating agencies and the Mediation Board are described in Chapter 2. The matrix below identifies the jurisdictions/entities that may be subject to the ONT Alternative Process.

## METHODOLOGY FOR CREATING THE ONT COMPATIBILITY PLAN

State law (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a)) dictates that airport land use compatibility plans be based upon an Airport Master Plan (AMP) or an Airport Layout Plan (ALP). Where an AMP is not available or is outdated, an ALP drawing can serve as the basis for compatibility planning, subject to the approval of the California Division of Aeronautics. An ALP is a drawing showing existing facilities and planned improvements. A typical AMP includes an ALP, but also provides textual background data, a discussion of forecasts, and an examination of alternatives along with detailed description of the proposed development. ALP's and AMP's are prepared for and adopted by the entity that owns and/or operates the airport. Most large, publicly owned airports have an AMP, but many smaller or private airports do not.

Applicability Matrix	San Bernardino County <sup>1</sup>	Riverside County <sup>2</sup>	Los Angeles County	Federal Agencies	Native American Tribes	Special Entities <sup>3</sup> of San Bernardino County
Required	x					x
Informational		x	x	x	x	

<sup>1</sup> The Cities within San Bernardino County that are required to participate in the Alternative Process include: Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, Chino, Montclair, Fontana and Upland.

<sup>2</sup> The County of Riverside having unincorporated lands within the noise impacted areas of Ontario International Airport has elected to participate in the compatibility planning process for the Airport on a discretionary basis.

<sup>3</sup> See definition for "Special Entity" on page 1-9 of this Chapter.

### ONT Master Plan Status

ONT has never had an adopted AMP that can serve as the basis for this *Compatibility Plan*. In 2002, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) initiated a master planning effort for ONT. A tentative proposal of the AMP involved reconfiguration of the runway system, shifting both runways south and east of their present positions. This reconfiguration was regarded necessary to enable the runway system to accommodate the volume of aircraft operations associated with the numbers of airline passengers and air cargo expected to use the airport by 2030. Before the new AMP could be completed and adopted, however, the nationwide economic downturn, coupled with local factors, resulted in a substantial decline in activity at ONT. With this decline, the urgency for completion of the AMP largely disappeared and, consequently, LAWA suspended work on the plan development in late 2008.

In August 2012 the City of Ontario and San Bernardino County formed the Ontario International Airport Authority (OIAA) by enacting a Joint Powers Agreement. The OIAA provides overall direction for the management, operations, development and marketing of ONT. The final transfer of ONT from LAWA to OIAA was approved in late 2016. OIAA has since reevaluated LAWA's proposal for

separating and lengthening the runways and runway modifications as unnecessary and requested the ONT ALUCP be based on the FAA approved 2018 ALP (see **Exhibit 1-5 and 1-6**).

## Future and Existing Activity Forecasts

The activity forecasts LAWA generated prior to the discontinuation of the AMP, explored several possible scenarios that the airport could experience. The *Compatibility Plan* is specifically focusing on the “no project” scenario, as defined in the preliminary ONT AMP.

The “no project” forecast assumes that the airport configuration would remain as it is today. This lack of airfield change would limit the airport to approximately 343,000 annual aircraft operations. The preliminary ONT AMP anticipated that this level of demand would be reached by 2030.

The 3.26 million tons of air cargo expected within the planning period includes both the off-airport United Parcel Service (UPS) activity, and the 1.6 million tons of air cargo served by the on-airport cargo facilities. UPS maintains a large sorting facility south of the airport with a through-the-fence access point. The UPS aircraft land and take off on the ONT runways but UPS cargo is loaded and unloaded at the private UPS site.

## Existing Airfield Configurations

The airport’s present runway system consists of two parallel runways (8L/26R and 8R/26L) oriented east and west. Runway 8L-26R is 12,200 feet in length, while Runway 8R-26L is 10,200 feet long. Runway 8L has a displaced threshold of 997 feet. Both runways are equipped with High-Intensity Runway Lights (HIRLs) and centerline lights. All runway ends are served by straight-in instrument approaches. Runway 26L has the lowest approach minimums with a straight-in ILS approach having a 200 foot vertical ceiling. The airport is served by an air traffic control tower which operates twenty-four hours a day.

The only published noise abatement procedure for the airport requires Runway 8L for departures and Runway 26L for arrivals between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. when weather conditions permit. This noise abatement procedure is also known a contra-flow. The contra-flow procedures are aimed at reducing the number of nighttime overflights of the residential neighborhoods west of the airport.

The most recent official ONT ALP drawing is one dated March 7, 2018. It shows the runway system in its existing configuration. Also, all runway ends, except Runway 8L, are shown having the largest size of runway protection zone (RPZ); specifically, 2,500 feet long, 1,000 feet inner width, and 1,750 feet outer width. This size RPZ is associated with a runway having approach visibility minimums lower than  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile and capable of serving all sizes of aircraft. The existing ALP also shows two RPZs west of the Runway 8L threshold. The approach RPZ begins 200 feet from the landing threshold and is 2,500 feet long, with a 1,000 foot inner width, and a 1,750 foot outer width. The departure RPZ begins 200 feet from the physical end of the runway and is 1,700 feet long, with a 500 foot inner width, and a 1,010 foot outer width.

**Note:** FAA recommends placing Building Restriction Lines (BRLs) on ALPs to identify suitable building area locations on airports. (FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13, Section 210).

## LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY

### State Law Requirements

General Plans and Specific Plans must be made consistent with adopted airport compatibility plans. Several sections of state law establish the relationship between Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans

and county and city General and Specific Plans. In particular, Government Code Section 65302.3 requires that General Plans and any applicable Specific Plans “shall be consistent with” the Compatibility Plan. This requirement is reiterated in local agencies’ obligations under the Alternative Process (Public Utilities Code Section 21670.1(c)(2)(D)).

A second point to emphasize is that the consistency requirement pertains only to future land use development. Nothing in state law or the *Compatibility Plan* requires that already existing development be removed or modified to eliminate incompatibilities that may already exist. Furthermore, General Plans and Specific Plans can show such land uses as continuing even though they would be nonconforming with the *Compatibility Plan* criteria. Conflicts of this type do not constitute inconsistencies between a General Plan or Specific Plan and the *Compatibility Plan*.

## Consistency Options

General Plans do not need to be identical with Compatibility Plans in order to achieve consistency with them a General Plan must do two things:

- It must specifically address compatibility planning issues, either directly or through reference to a zoning ordinance or other policy document; and
- It must avoid direct conflicts with the Compatibility Plan development policies and criteria.

Compatibility planning issues can be reflected in a General Plan in one, or a combination, of several ways:

- ➔ **Incorporate Policies into Existing General Plan Elements**—One method of achieving the necessary planning consistency is to modify existing General Plan elements. For example, airport land use noise policies could be inserted into the noise element, safety policies could be placed into a safety element and the primary compatibility criteria and associated maps plus the procedural policies might fit into the land use element. With this approach, direct conflicts would be eliminated and the majority of the mechanisms and procedures necessary to ensure compliance with compatibility criteria could be fully incorporated into the local jurisdiction’s General Plan.
- ➔ **Adopt a General Plan Airport Element**—Another approach is to prepare a separate airport element of the General Plan. Such a format may be advantageous when the community’s General Plan also needs to address on-airport development and operational issues. Modification of other plan elements to provide cross-referencing and eliminate conflicts would still be necessary.
- ➔ **Adopt Compatibility Plan as Standalone Document**—A jurisdiction selecting this option would simply adopt as a local policy document the relevant portions of the compatibility plan—specifically, the policies and maps. Applicable background information could be included as well if desired. Changes to the community’s existing General Plan would be minimal. Policy reference to the *Compatibility Plan* would need to be added and any direct land use or other conflicts with compatibility planning criteria would have to be removed. Limited discussion of compatibility planning issues could be included in the General Plan, but the substance of most compatibility policies would appear only in the stand-alone document.
- ➔ **Adopt an Airport Overlay Zone**—Affected jurisdictions can adopt an airport overlay zone for the areas of impact and make reference to them within their respective General Plans or Specific Plans. The airport overlay zone would act as added layer of standards/restrictions over the existing zoning land use designation. Other than where direct conflicts need to be eliminated from the local plans, implementation of procedural and compatibility policies would be accomplished solely through the zoning ordinance. Policy reference to airport compatibility in

the General Plan could be as simple as mentioning support for the compatibility planning process indicated in the compatibility plan and stating that policy implementation is by means of the overlay zone. (An outline of topics which could be addressed in an airport overlay zone is included in Appendix E.)

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This *Compatibility Plan* is a stand-alone document that addresses airport land use compatibility issues for ONT. Although, this is the first stand-alone document created, the City of Ontario performed airport compatibility planning for the areas around ONT by implementing policies of the 1992 General Plan, Airport Environs Section. The City of Ontario's 2010 General Plan refers to this *Compatibility Plan* for guidance on compatibility planning matters.

### Definitions for this Compatibility Plan

1. **Action:** A proposed General Plan, Specific Plan, policy document, or individual development project subject to review under the ONT Alternative Process defined in this chapter. Also, an airport master plan, airport layout plan, and certain types of airport improvements proposed by OIAA for ONT which would require amendment of the Airport Permit.
2. **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.
3. **Affected Agency:** Any county, city, or special district having lands within the ONT Airport Influence Area (AIA). Consistent with state law, each county within the State of California is responsible for its own airport land use compatibility planning efforts. Thus, the policies of this *Compatibility Plan* apply only to the affected agencies of San Bernardino County. However, since the AIA extends beyond the limits of San Bernardino County, information about the airport impacts extending into Riverside and Los Angeles Counties is provided for informational purposes. That is, the affected agencies of Riverside and Los Angeles Counties may use the information and compatibility policies provided herein at their discretion.
  - (a) **Affected Agencies in San Bernardino County:**
    - ➔ Cities of Ontario, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Rancho Cucamonga, and Upland.
    - ➔ San Bernardino County, as the jurisdiction having control over unincorporated San Bernardino County lands within the AIA.
    - ➔ Ontario International Airport Authority (OIAA), the owner and operator of Ontario International Airport.
    - ➔ Special entities including school districts, community college districts, and special districts whose boundaries include lands within the San Bernardino County portion of the AIA.
  - (b) **Affected Agencies outside San Bernardino County:**
    - ➔ Riverside County, as the jurisdiction having control over unincorporated Riverside County lands within the AIA.

- ➔ The City of Eastvale and any future city that may be incorporated within the affected portion of Riverside County.
  - ➔ Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission.
  - ➔ Cities of Pomona and Claremont, each of which has jurisdiction over portions of the AIA within Los Angeles County.
  - ➔ The Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission.
4. **Airport:** Ontario International Airport (ONT), a commercial airport in the City of Ontario that is owned and operated by Ontario International Airport Authority (OIAA).
  5. **Airport Influence Area (AIA):** An area, as delineated in **Map 2-1** (see Chapter 2), in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restriction on those uses.
  6. **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 heliport. Such uses specifically include runways, taxiways, and their associated protection areas defined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), together with aircraft aprons, hangars, fixed base operations facilities, terminal buildings, etc.
  7. **Alternative Process:** State law provides for what is generally known as the “Alternative Process” wherein counties do not have to form an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Instead, the County and affected cities having jurisdiction over an airport are responsible for compatibility planning efforts.
  8. **Compatibility Plan:** This document, the *Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.
  9. **Local Jurisdiction:** Any county or city within the ONT AIA.
  10. **Major Land Use Action:** Actions related to proposed land uses for which compatibility with airport activity is a particular concern. These types of actions are listed in Table 2-1 of Chapter 2. Minor actions (e.g., ministerial acts) are not subject to compatibility reviews.
  11. **Special Entity:** Special districts, school districts, and community college districts owning property or having boundaries within the San Bernardino County portions of the Airport Influence Area.

## Table and Map Descriptions

The exhibits at the end of this chapter illustrate the different compatibility factors and other data which were used to evaluate and guide the creation of the ONT compatibility policies and maps that are part of Chapter 2.

### Table Descriptions

- ➔ **Airport History & Development Summary** — **Exhibit 1-1** provides a historical timeline of airport events and facility improvements.
- ➔ **Airport Features Summary** — **Exhibit 1-2** provides a tabular summary of the airfield features at ONT.
- ➔ **Airport Activity Data Summary** — **Exhibit 1-3** summarizes future “no project” aircraft activity data as developed by LAWA for the discontinued AMP.

- ➔ **Airport Environs Information** — **Exhibit 1-4** provides a summary of land use policies for neighboring jurisdictions, as well as the status of local plans.
- ➔ **OIAA ALP Update Letter** — **Exhibit 1-5** OIAA letter requesting the ONT ALUCP be based on the 2018 FAA approved ALP.

### **Map Descriptions**

- ➔ **ONT ALP** — **Exhibit 1-6** is the ONT 2018 FAA approved Airport Layout Plan.
- ➔ **Runway Protection Zones: West** — The OIAA employs the use of approach/departure RPZs for Runway 8L. However, the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA’s) standard RPZ for runways with instrument approach minimums of less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile is larger and would extend further beyond the airport property. The FAA’s standard RPZ (1,000 feet inner width by 2,500 feet length by 1,750 feet outer width) would begin 200 feet beyond the west end of Runway 8L. **Exhibit 1-7** displays the established approach/departure RPZs for Runway 8L as depicted in OIAA’s Airport Layout Plan dated March 7, 2018. The FAA’s standard RPZ is also shown for comparative purposes.
- ➔ **Compatibility Factors: Safety** — The area of safety concern is depicted in **Exhibit 1-8** using the generic safety zones for a large air carrier runway. These safety zones are taken from the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (January 2002) published by the California Division of Aeronautics.
- ➔ **Compatibility Factors: Noise** — Noise contours are shown in **Exhibit 1-9**. The contours reflect the “no project” activity levels of 343,100 annual aircraft operations.
- ➔ **Compatibility Factors: Airspace** — Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77 airspace surfaces for ONT are depicted in **Exhibits 1-10 Existing Airspace**. The height notification surface boundary is based on the combination of the existing and future runway configurations.
- ➔ **Modeled Flight Routes** — **Exhibit 1-11** depicts the flight tracks which were modeled while creating noise contours for the airport. The flight envelope is shown to visualize the standard flight routes to and from the airport, including those that are infrequently flown.
- ➔ **Flight Track Altitudes: Arrivals and Departures** — Radar tracks by altitude and a flight track envelope are included for **Exhibits 1-12** through **1-16**. The radar tracks shown reflect several days’ worth of aircraft operations at ONT. The radar tracks were recorded during times of normal east to west operation as well as contra-flow operations. These tracks did not, however, record many instances of west to east operations which occur when the Santa Ana winds are blowing. The flight envelope is provided to help visualize the areas that are commonly overflowed by aircraft.
- ➔ **Existing Land Use** — The existing land uses for the areas within the vicinity of the airport are shown in **Exhibit 1-17**.
- ➔ **General Plan Land Use: City of Ontario** — The General Plan Policy Plan was adopted in January 2010 as depicted in **Exhibit 1-18**.
- ➔ **General Plan Land Use: Other Jurisdictions** — **Exhibit 1-19a** displays the neighboring jurisdictions’ adopted General Plan land use designations. The land use legends are shown in **Exhibit 1-19b**.