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AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 1 - 2013

A RESOLUTION OF THE SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ADOPTING THE INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE SACRAMENTO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments ("SACOG") is designated as the Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") for the Sacramento Region, pursuant to Article 3.5, Chapter 4, Part 1, Division 9, of the Public Utilities Code; and

WHEREAS, SACOG prepared a draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("Plan") for Sacramento International Airport which was approved for public release by the ALUC on June 20, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the draft Plan was prepared with advice from a technical advisory committee including key stakeholders, organizations, and agencies which might be affected by the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the cities of Davis, Roseville, Sacramento, West Sacramento, and Woodland and the counties of Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yolo, as the affected local land use agencies, were provided with the draft Plan and the draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration was circulated for public review from June 27, 2013, through July 31, 2013.

WHEREAS, a public meeting was held on July 16, 2013, to receive comment from the public on the draft Plan and draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, notice of the July 16, 2013, public meeting was mailed to property owners adjacent to the airport and a legal notice was published in the Sacramento Bee; and

WHEREAS, based upon written and oral comments received during the public review period, revisions were made to the draft Plan; and
WHEREAS, the SACOG Board of Directors approved the release of the revised draft Plan on November 14, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Study/Negative Declaration was not revised and recirculation was not required, as the changes made to the Plan in response to comments did not create a significant environmental impact; and

WHEREAS, all of the parties who submitted written comments on the earlier draft Plan have indicated that they support the revisions in the revised draft Plan; and

WHEREAS, no other substantive comments on the revised draft Plan or the draft Negative Declaration have been received; and

WHEREAS, the SACOG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission of Sacramento County, has considered all of the oral and written comments received, staff reports, and all other materials in the record of proceedings, and is fully informed thereon.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the SACOG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") of Sacramento County, that:

1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are hereby adopted.

2. The ALUC has been presented with the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, has independently reviewed and considered the information contained therein, and the Initial Study/Negative Declaration reflects the ALUC’s independent judgment and analysis.

3. There is no substantial evidence in the record that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.

4. The Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is hereby adopted.

5. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the SACOG Board of Directors has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from SACOG at 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 12th day of December 2013, by the following vote of the SACOG Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Mary Jane Griego  
Chair

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 2 - 2013

A RESOLUTION OF THE SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ADOPTING THE SACRAMENTO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments ("SACOG") is designated as the Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") for the Sacramento Region, pursuant to Article 3.5, Chapter 4, Part 1, Division 9, of the Public Utilities Code; and

WHEREAS, SACOG has prepared an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("Plan") for Sacramento International Airport, including a revised Airport Influence Area, in order to preserve and protect the airport and the land uses surrounding it pursuant to Public Utilities Code §21670, subdivision (a); and

WHEREAS, the draft Plan was prepared with advice from a technical advisory committee including representatives from local government and other agencies which might be affected by the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the cities of Davis, Roseville, Sacramento, West Sacramento, and Woodland and counties of Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yolo, as the affected local land use agencies, have reviewed the draft Plan; and

WHEREAS, a properly noticed public meeting was held on July 16, 2013, to receive comment from the public on the draft Plan and draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, known stakeholders, including landowners and affected local jurisdictions, were provided notice and consulted about the major policies of the draft Plan; and

WHEREAS, based upon written and oral comments received during the public review period, responses to comments were prepared and revisions were made to the draft Plan; and

WHEREAS, the SACOG Board of Directors approved the release of the revised draft Plan on November 14, 2013; and
WHEREAS, all of the parties who submitted written comments on the earlier draft Plan have indicated that they support the revisions to the Plan; and

WHEREAS, no other substantive comments on the revised draft Plan have been received; and

WHEREAS, the SACOG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission of Sacramento County, has adopted the Initial Study/Negative Declaration for Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and has considered all of the oral and written comments received, staff reports, and all other materials in the record of proceedings, and is fully informed thereon.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the SACOG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission of Sacramento County, hereby adopts the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Sacramento International Airport, including a revised Airport Influence Area.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 12th day of December 2013, by the following vote of the SACOG Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Mary Jane Griego  
Chair  

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer
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Chapter 1

Introduction
Introduction

Overview of the Plan

This Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is one of a series of compatibility plans adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) acting in its capacity as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties. The basic function of the plan is to promote compatibility between Sacramento International Airport and the land uses surrounding it to the extent that these areas have not already been devoted to incompatible uses. The plan accomplishes this function through establishment of a set of compatibility criteria applicable to new development around the airport. Neither this Compatibility Plan nor the ALUC have authority over existing land uses or over operation of the airport.

Geographically, the Compatibility Plan pertains to portions of the jurisdictions of Sacramento, Sutter, and Yolo counties, together with parts of the cities of Davis, Sacramento, West Sacramento, and Woodland. Special districts, school districts, and community college districts within those jurisdictions are also subject to the provisions of the plan. The authority of the ALUC does not extend to state, federal, or tribal lands.

Airport Land Use Compatibility Planning

The creation of airport land use commissions and the preparation of airport land use compatibility plans are requirements of the California State Aeronautics Act (Aeronautics Act / Public Utilities Code Section 21670 et seq.). Provisions for creation of ALUCs were first established under state law in 1967 (see Appendix B for a copy of the statutes). With limited exceptions, an ALUC is required in every county in the state and a compatibility plan is required for each public-use and military airport.

Purpose and Objective

Although the Aeronautics Act has been amended numerous times since its original enactment, the fundamental purpose of ALUCs to promote land use compatibility around airports has remained unchanged. As expressed in the present statutes, this purpose is:

“...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 compatibility plans they adopt are the basic tools that ALUCs use to achieve this purpose. The ultimate objective of ALUCs, though, is to ensure that land use actions taken by local agencies also adhere to this purpose. ALUCs pursue this objective by reviewing the general plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, building regulations, and certain individual development actions of local agencies for consistency with the policies and criteria in the applicable compatibility plan. ALUCs also review master plans and other development plans for civilian airports proposed by airport operators to determine if those plans are consistent with the compatibility plan or if modifications should be made to the compatibility plan to reflect current airport planning.

Relationship between ALUCs and County and City Governments

The relationship between ALUCs and the governments of the counties and the cities within their jurisdiction is set forth in the Aeronautics Act. For the most part, ALUCs act independently from the local land use jurisdictions. ALUCs must consult with the involved agencies regarding establishment of airport influence area boundaries (Public Utilities Code Section 21675(c)), but otherwise have the authority to adopt compatibility plans without approval from county or city governing bodies. ALUCs, though, do not have the authority to implement their own compatibility policies.

The responsibility for implementation of ALUC-adopted compatibility plans rests with the affected local agencies. Government Code Section 65302.3 establishes that each county and city affected by an airport land use compatibility plan must make its general plan and any applicable specific plans consistent with the ALUC’s compatibility plan. Alternatively, local agencies can take the series of steps listed in the Aeronautics Act and described later in this chapter to overrule the ALUC policies.

Local agencies’ other responsibility is to refer their plans and certain other proposed land use actions to the ALUC for review and determination of those actions’ consistency with the ALUC’s compatibility plan. Proposed adoption or amendment of general plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, and building regulations always must be referred to the ALUC. However, other actions such as ones associated with individual development proposals are subject to ALUC review only until the local agency’s general plan and specific plan(s) have been made consistent with the compatibility plan or the agency has overruled the ALUC.

Compatibility Plan Policy Framework

State Laws and Guidelines

Many of the procedures that govern how ALUCs operate are defined by state law, particularly the Aeronautics Act. As noted earlier, statutory provisions in the Public Utilities Code establish the requirements for ALUC adoption of compatibility plans, which airports must have these plans, and some of the steps involved in plan adoption. The Aeronautics Act also dictates the requirements for airport land use compatibility reviews by the ALUC. The types of actions that local jurisdictions must refer for review are specified, for example.

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 Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics. Specifically, the Aeronautics Act says that, when preparing compatibility plans for individual airports, ALUCs shall “be guided by” the information contained 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 Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan take into account the guidance provided by the current edition of the Handbook, dated October 2011.

An additional function of the Airport Land Use Planning 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. Specifically, Section 21096 requires that lead agencies must use the Handbook as “a technical resource” when assessing airport-related noise and safety impacts of projects located in the vicinity of airports.

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).

**Compatibility Plan Relationship to Airport Plans**

Airport land use compatibility plans are distinct from airport master plans and other types of airport development plans, but are closely connected to them. In simple terms, the issues addressed by airport master plans are primarily on-airport whereas those of concern in a compatibility plan are mostly off-airport. The purpose of airport master plans is to assess the demand for airport facilities and to guide the development necessary to meet those demands. An airport master plan is prepared for and adopted by the agency that owns and/or operates the airport. In contrast, the major purpose of a compatibility plan is to ensure that incompatible development does not occur on lands surrounding the airports. The responsibility for preparation and adoption of compatibility plans lies with each county’s airport land use commission.

The principal connection between the two types of plans stems from the Aeronautics Act. Specifically, Public Utilities Code Section 21675(a) requires that ALUC plans be based upon a long-range airport master plan adopted by the airport owner/proprietor or, if such a plan does not exist for a particular airport, an airport layout plan may be used with the approval of the California Division of Aeronautics. Furthermore, the compatibility plan must reflect “the anticipated growth of the airport during at least the next 20 years.”

The connection works in both directions. While a compatibility plan must be based upon an airport master plan, Public Utilities Code Section 21676(c) requires that any proposed modification to an airport master plan be referred to the ALUC to determine if the proposal is consistent with the compatibility plan. Provided that the off-airport compatibility implications of the proposed modifications are adequately addressed in the master plan, the outcome of this process usually is that the compatibility plan will need to be updated to mirror the new master plan.

**Compatibility Planning for Sacramento International Airport**

**Responsibilities**

The responsibility for preparation of a compatibility plan for the Sacramento International Airport environs rests with SACOG which serves as the ALUC for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba
counties in accordance with the designated body provisions of Public Utilities Code Section 21670.1. The counties of El Dorado and Placer, although members of SACOG, have their own ALUCs.

Sacramento International Airport is situated in an unincorporated area of northwestern Sacramento County, but has far reaching impacts across multiple counties and cities. Because SACOG’s ALUC jurisdiction includes Sutter and Yuba counties, in addition to Sacramento County, this Compatibility Plan applies within each of these counties and also their incorporated cities. Although a small portion of the overflight impact area identified herein extends into Placer County, the policies of this Compatibility Plan are strictly advisory with respect to lands in that county.

This Compatibility Plan replaces an earlier plan—Sacramento International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan—which the ALUC adopted for the airport in 1984 and last revised in January 1994.

**Sources of Information and Guidance**

As required by the Aeronautics Act, the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook provides guidance for the compatibility policies set forth in this Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Handbook was used both to structure and define compatibility criteria and to establish the procedures to be followed by the ALUC and local agencies in implementation of the criteria.

The Sacramento International Airport Master Plan adopted by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors in 2004 is one of the primary sources of information used in this Compatibility Plan regarding the County’s long-range development proposals for the airport. Additional sources are the environmental review documents associated with the Master Plan and the 2012 Airport Layout Plan. The development proposals considered in these planning documents include the addition of a parallel, third runway on the west and the extension of the existing east runway. Chapter 3 of this Compatibility Plan contains more detailed information on the existing and ultimate airport configuration.

With respect to aircraft activity projections, the Compatibility Plan primarily relies upon an analysis of the functional capacity of the airport for land use compatibility. This “Theoretic Capacity” that resulted was based on the assumption of all planned facilities being developed. The analysis determined that the airport would have a Theoretic Capacity of approximately 450,000 annual operations. This number represents a conservative estimate (that is, at the upper end of the reasonably likely range) for activity levels at the airport well beyond the 20-year minimum planning period of this document.

Finally, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was established specifically for the Compatibility Plan project. The committee’s membership consisted of staff from the Sacramento County Airport System which operates the airport and the planning departments of the affected counties and cities. The TAC assisted with providing airport and land use data, reviewing discussion papers and draft materials, and providing comments for consideration in the draft plan.

**General Plan Consistency**

As noted above, each local agency having jurisdiction over land uses within an ALUC’s planning area is required by state law 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 compatibility plan.
Overrule Process

The only other course of action available to local agencies is to overrule the ALUC by 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 in the Aeronautics Act. Additionally, the local agency must provide both the ALUC and the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, with a copy of the local agency’s proposed decision and findings at least 45 days in advance of its decision to overrule and must hold a public hearing on the proposed overruling (Public Utilities Code Section 21676(a) and (b)). The ALUC and the Division of Aeronautics may provide comments to the local agency within 30 days of receiving the proposed decision and findings. If comments are submitted, the local agency must include them in the public record of the final decision to overrule the ALUC (Sections 21676, 21676.5 and 21677). Note that similar requirements apply to local agency overruling of ALUC actions concerning individual development proposals for which ALUC review is mandatory (Section 21676.5(a)) and airport master plans (Section 21676(c)).

Attaining Consistency

A general plan does not need to be identical with the ALUC compatibility plan in order to be consistent with the compatibility plan. To meet the consistency test, 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 compatibility planning criteria.

The land use jurisdictions affected by this *Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* may need to modify their general plans, specific plans, and other policy documents to be consistent with the *Compatibility Plan*. It must be emphasized, however, that local agencies need not change land use designations to make them consistent with the ALUC criteria if the current designations reflect existing development. They merely would need to establish policies to ensure that the nonconforming uses would not be expanded in a manner inconsistent with this *Compatibility Plan* and that any redevelopment of the affected areas would be consistent with the *Compatibility Plan*.

Compatibility planning issues can be reflected in a general plan in several ways:

- **Incorporate Policies into Existing General Plan Elements**—One method of achieving 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 Stand-Alone Document**—Jurisdictions selecting this option would simply adopt as a local policy document the relevant portions of the *Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*—specifically, the policies and maps in Chapters 2. Applicable background
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

information from Chapter 3 could be included as well. 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 Airport Combining District or Overlay Zoning Ordinance—This approach is similar to the stand-alone document except that the local jurisdiction would not explicitly adopt the Compatibility Plan as policy. Instead, the compatibility policies would be restructured as an airport combining or overlay zoning ordinance. A combining zone serves as an overlay of standard community-wide land use zones and modifies or limits the uses permitted by the underlying zone. Flood hazard combining zoning is a common example. An airport combining zone ordinance can serve as a convenient means of bringing various airport compatibility criteria into one place. The airport-related height-limit zoning that many jurisdictions have adopted as a means of protecting airport airspace is a form of combining district zoning. Noise and safety compatibility criteria, together with procedural policies, would need to be added to create a complete airport compatibility zoning ordinance. Other than where direct conflicts need to be eliminated from the local plans, implementation of the 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 airport land use commission and stating that policy implementation is by means of the combining zone. (An outline of topics which could be addressed in an airport combining zone is included in Appendix H.)

PLAN CONTENTS

This Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan is complete unto itself and is separate and independent from other compatibility plans adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. The Compatibility Plan is organized into three chapters and a set of appendices. The intent of this introductory chapter is to set the overall context of airport land use compatibility planning in general and for Sacramento International Airport in particular.

The most important components of the plan are found in Chapter 2. That chapter contains the policies by which the ALUC operates and conducts compatibility reviews of proposed land use and airport development actions. It also specifies the compatibility criteria and other policies applicable specifically to Sacramento International Airport. Chapter 3 presents various background data regarding features, impacts, and environs of Sacramento International Airport. Chapter 3 also serves to document the data and assumptions upon which the compatibility policy maps for the airport are based.

Also included in this document are a set of appendices containing a copy of state statutes concerning airport land use commissions and other general information pertaining to airport land use compatibility planning. This material is mostly taken from other sources and does not represent ALUC policy except where cited as such in Chapter 2—specifically the state ALUC statutes and certain other laws (Appendix B) and Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 (Appendix C).

In support of the adoption of this Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, an Initial Study of environmental impacts was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. Issues addressed included those identified in the 2007 California Supreme Court decision in Muzzy Ranch Company v. Solano Airport Land Use Commission. These issues include assessment of the potential future displacement
of residential and nonresidential land use development as a result of implementation of the *Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments Board of Directors, acting in its capacity as the Airport Land Use Commission for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties, adopted a Negative Declaration and this *Compatibility Plan* on December 12, 2013.
Chapter 2
Policies
1. **General Applicability**

1.1. **Purpose and Use**

1.1.1. *Airport Land Use Commission:* The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is designated to serve as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.

1.1.2. *Basic Purpose:* The basic purpose of this *Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* is to establish procedures and criteria applicable to airport land use compatibility planning in the vicinity of Sacramento International Airport. The *Compatibility Plan* is prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code Section 21670 et seq.) and guidance provided in the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook)* published by the California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics in October 2011.

1.1.3. *Use by ALUC:* The ALUC shall:

   (a) Formally adopt this *Compatibility Plan* in accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 21674(c).

   (b) When a *Land Use Action* or *Airport-Related Action* is referred for review as provided by Section 1.5, make a determination as to whether such *Action* is consistent with the criteria set forth in this *Compatibility Plan*.

1.1.4. *Use by Affected Local Agencies:*

(a) This *Compatibility Plan* and its policies shall apply to all of the following affected *Local Agencies* (see Policy 1.2.24), each of which has or may in the future have jurisdiction over lands within parts of the Sacramento International *Airport Influence Area* defined by this plan; specifically:

   (1) County of Sacramento.
   (2) County of Sutter.
   (3) County of Yolo.
   (4) County of Yuba.
   (5) City of Davis.
   (6) City of Sacramento.
   (7) City of West Sacramento.
(8) City of Woodland.

(9) Any future city within Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties that may be incorporated within all or part of the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area.

(10) Special districts, school districts and community college districts within Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties to the extent that the district boundaries extend into the Airport Influence Area.

(b) Local Agencies preparing an environmental document for any Project within the Airport Influence Area shall address the compatibility criteria contained in this Compatibility Plan in addition to referencing guidance from the Handbook.¹

(c) Each of the affected counties and municipalities shall:

(1) Modify its respective general plan, applicable specific plan(s), and zoning ordinance to be consistent with the policies in the Compatibility Plan.²

(2) Utilize the Compatibility Plan, either directly or as reflected in the appropriately modified general plan and zoning ordinance, when making other planning decisions regarding proposed development of lands with the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area.

(3) Refer proposed Land Use Actions for review by the ALUC as specified by Policies 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 herein.

(d) Special districts, school districts, and community college districts shall:

(1) Apply the policies of this Compatibility Plan when creating plans and making other planning decisions regarding the proposed development of lands under their control with the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area.

(2) Refer proposed Land Use Actions for review by the ALUC as specified by Policies 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 herein.

(e) As the Airport owner, the County of Sacramento, shall refer proposed airport master plans and certain airport improvement plans to the ALUC for review (see Policy 1.5.5).

1.1.5. Use by Federal and State Entities: Lands controlled 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.

1.1.6. Effective Date: The policies in this Compatibility Plan shall become effective as of the date that the ALUC adopts the plan. The Effective Date of this Compatibility Plan is [date to be inserted].

¹ The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires environmental documents for Projects situated within an Airport Influence Area to evaluate whether the Project would expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive levels of airport-related noise or to airport-related safety hazards (Public Resources Code Section 21096). In the preparation of such environmental documents, the law specifically requires that the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook published by the California Division of Aeronautics be utilized as a technical resource.

² 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.
(a) The previous compatibility plan for the Airport, Sacramento International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, was adopted by the ALUC in 1984 with the last amendment adopted in 1994. The earlier plan, as amended in 1994, shall remain in effect until the Effective Date of this Compatibility Plan and shall again become effective if the entirety of this Compatibility Plan were to be invalidated by court action.

(b) Any Project or phase of a Project that has received Local Agency approvals sufficient to qualify it as an Existing Land Use (see Policies 1.2.18 and 1.4.2) prior to the Effective Date of this Compatibility Plan shall not be required to comply with the policies herein. Rather, the policies of the 1994 amended compatibility plan shall apply.

1.1.7. Examples: Where an example is used in this Compatibility Plan, such example or examples are provided for purposes of illustration only and any such example or set of examples are not intended nor shall such be construed as an exhaustive list of the subject matter to which it corresponds.

1.2. Definitions

The following definitions apply for the purposes of the policies set forth in this Compatibility Plan. Additional terms are defined in the Glossary (Appendix I).

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 (also known as the California State Aeronautics Act).

1.2.2. Air Operations Area (AOA): Any area of an airport used or intended to be used for landing, takeoff, or surface maneuvering of aircraft. An air operations area includes such paved areas or unpaved areas that are used or intended to be used for the unobstructed movement of aircraft in addition to its associated runway, taxiways, or apron. See Map 5 for depiction of the existing Sacramento International Airport AOA.

1.2.3. Airport: Sacramento International Airport, a public-use airport owned by the County of Sacramento and operated by the Sacramento County Airport System (SCAS).

1.2.4. Airport Influence Area: An area, as delineated herein (see Map 1 at back of Chapter 2), 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 ALUC review to determine consistency with the policies herein.

1.2.5. Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC): The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) acting in its capacity as the Airport Land Use Commission for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.

1.2.6. Airport Land Use Commission Secretary: The Chief Executive Officer of SACOG or a person designated by the Chief Executive Officer with the concurrence of the SACOG Chairperson.

1.2.7. 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
Policy 3.5.3 for applicability. Also see Policy 1.2.34 for a related buyer awareness tool, Recorded Overflight Notification.

1.2.8. **Airspace Protection Area:** The area beneath the Airspace Protection Surfaces for Sacramento International Airport as depicted on Maps 4a, 4b, and 4c, Compatibility Policy Map: Airspace Protection for the existing and two alternative future runway configurations.

1.2.9. **Airspace Protection Surfaces:** Imaginary surfaces in the airspace surrounding the Sacramento International Airport defined in accordance with criteria set forth in Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77. These surfaces 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.

1.2.10. **Ancillary Use:** A use related to the primary use and occupying no more than 10% of total building floor area.

1.2.11. **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, but are not limited to, 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.

1.2.12. **Avigation Easement:** An easement that conveys 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 H).

1.2.13. **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.

1.2.14. **Compatibility Plan:** This document, the Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

1.2.15. **Compatibility Zone:** Any of the noise, safety, airspace protection, or overflight zones established herein.

1.2.16. **Critical Airspace Protection Zone:** A Compatibility Zone consisting of the Federal Aviation Regulations (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.

1.2.17. **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 safety compatibility criteria (compare Intensity). Density is calculated on the basis of the overall site size (i.e., gross acreage of the site).

1.2.18. **Existing Land Use:** A land use that either physically exists or for which Local Agency (see Policy 1.2.24) commitments to the proposal have been obtained (see Policy 1.4.2).

1.2.19. **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. FAR Part 77 establishes standards for identifying obstructions to navigable airspace, sets forth requirements for notice to the FAA of certain proposed construction or alteration, and provides for aero-
nautical studies of obstructions to determine their effect on the safe and efficient use of airspace. (See Appendix C of this Compatibility Plan for the text of FAR Part 77; also see Glossary).


1.2.21. *Infill:* Development of vacant or underutilized land within areas that are already largely developed or used more intensively. See Policy 4.1.1 for criteria used to identify Infill areas for the purposes of this Compatibility Plan.

1.2.22. *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 *Density*). Sitewide average Intensity is calculated on the basis of the overall site size (i.e., gross acreage of the site).

1.2.23. *Land Use of Special Concern:* A land use that represents special safety concerns irrespective of the number of people associated with the use. Specifically: uses with vulnerable occupants; hazardous materials storage; or critical community infrastructure.

1.2.24. *Local Agency:* Any county, city, or other local governmental entity such as a special district, school district, or community college district—including any future city or district—having any jurisdictional territory lying within the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area as defined herein. These entities are subject to the provisions of this Compatibility Plan.

1.2.25. *Major Land Use Action:* Actions related to proposed land uses for which compatibility with Airport activity is a particular concern, but for which ALUC review is not always mandatory under state law. These types of actions are listed in Policy 1.5.4.

1.2.26. *Noise Impact Area:* The area within which the noise impacts, measured in terms of CNEL, generated by aircraft operating at the Airport may represent a land use compatibility concern. The Noise Impact Area for Sacramento International Airport is depicted on Map 2, Compatibility Policy Map: Noise.

1.2.27. *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.

1.2.28. *Nonconforming Use:* An Existing Land Use that does not comply with the compatibility criteria set forth in this Compatibility Plan. See Policy 4.1.3 for criteria applicable to Land Use Actions involving Nonconforming Uses.

1.2.29. *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.

1.2.30. *Overrule:* An action that a Local Agency can take in accordance with provisions of state law if the Local Agency wishes to proceed with adoption or amendment of a general plan or spe-
cific plan, adoption or approval of a zoning ordinance or building regulation, or modification of an airport master plan\(^3\) or, under conditions specified in Section 1.5.2, a Major Land Use Action\(^4\) affecting the Airport Influence Area in spite of an ALUC finding that the Land Use Action is inconsistent with this Compatibility Plan. See Section 1.6 for process required to overrule the ALUC. Similar Overrule provisions are also available to Sacramento County as the agency owning Sacramento International Airport if the ALUC were to find a proposed airport master plan inconsistent with the Compatibility Plan.

1.2.31. **Primary Approach Area:** The area is comprised of: all locations within the CNEL 60 dB contour depicted on Map 2; all locations within Safety Zones 1 through 5 as depicted on Map 3; all locations within the Critical Airspace Protection Zone as depicted on Maps 4a, 4b, or 4c.

1.2.32. **Project; Land Use Action; Development Proposal:** Terms similar in meaning and all referring to the types of land use development activities, either publicly or privately sponsored, that are subject to the provisions of this Compatibility Plan.

1.2.33. **Reconstruction:** The rebuilding of an existing nonconforming structure that has been fully or partially destroyed as a result of a calamity (not planned Reconstruction or Redevelopment). See Policy 4.1.3(c)(3).

1.2.34. **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 Avigation Easement (see Policy 1.2.10), 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 Policy 3.5.2 for applicability. Also see Policy 1.2.7 for a related buyer awareness tool, Airport Proximity Disclosure.

1.2.35. **Redevelopment:** Development of a new use (not necessarily a new type of use) to replace an existing use at a Density or Intensity that may vary from the existing use. Redevelopment Projects are subject to the provisions of this Compatibility Plan to the same extent as other forms of proposed development.

1.2.36. **Residential Development:** Any subdivision of land for residential purposes or any construction of residential units other than on an existing designated single-family residential parcel.

1.2.37. **Routine Overflight Zone:** The area commonly overflown by aircraft at an altitude of approximately 3,000 feet or less as they approach, depart, or engage in flight training at Sacramento International Airport.

1.2.38. **Traffic Pattern Area:** The area near the Airport within which aircraft are engaged in initial climb-out, final descent, or closed-circuit flight training. Aircraft within this area regularly fly at an altitude of 2,000 feet or less. (See Map 6 at back of Chapter 2.)

---

\(^3\) Public Utilities Code Sections 21676(a), (b), and (c).

\(^4\) Public Utilities Code Section 21676.5(a).
1.3. Geographic Scope

1.3.1. Sacramento International Airport Influence Area: As defined in accordance with state law, the influence area of Sacramento International Airport 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. The Sacramento International Airport Influence Area is depicted in Map 1 and is controlled by the overflight area boundary. ALUC establishment of the Airport Influence Area requires “hearing and consultation with the involved agencies.”

(a) The Airport Influence Area constitutes the area within which certain Land Use Actions are subject to ALUC review to determine consistency with the Compatibility Plan.

(b) In delineating the Airport Influence Area, the geographic extents of four types of compatibility concerns are considered:

(1) Noise: Locations exposed to potentially disruptive levels of aircraft noise. For the purposes of this Compatibility Plan, these locations are deemed to be ones within the Sacramento International Airport projected CNEL 60 dB contour. See Policy 3.2.2 and Map 2.

(2) Safety: Areas where the risk of an aircraft accident poses heightened safety concerns for people and property on the ground. For the purposes of this Compatibility Plan, these locations are as shown on Map 3.

(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. These land use characteristics include ones that attract hazardous wildlife. The airspace protection areas for Sacramento International Airport are depicted on Maps 4a, 4b, 4c, and 5.

(4) Overflight: Locations where aircraft overflying can be intrusive and annoying to many people. For the purposes of this Compatibility Plan, these locations are considered to be ones regularly overflown at an altitude of approximately 3,000 feet or less by aircraft arriving, departing, or engaged at flight training at the airport (see Exhibit 11 in Chapter 3). The overflight area is illustrated on Map 6 and is the controlling determinant of the Airport Influence Area boundary.

(c) Each of these four concerns is separately addressed in this Compatibility Plan within its own “layer” representing that particular compatibility factor. See Section 3 for the policies and maps associated with each layer.

(d) Other impacts sometimes created by airports (e.g., air pollution, automobile traffic, etc.) are not addressed herein and are not factors that the ALUC shall consider in reviewing land use Projects.

1.3.2. Airport Runway Configuration Assumptions: The Sacramento County Airport System (SCAS), operator of Sacramento International Airport, proposes to modify the existing Airport
runway system configuration by extending the eastern runway and adding a parallel third runway on the west. Two different scenarios for the eastern runway extension have been considered by SCAS and, as of the adoption date of this Compatibility Plan, both remain as options (see details in Chapter 3).

(a) For the purposes of this Compatibility Plan, land use compatibility planning and protection shall be provided and account for both of the contemplated future runway scenarios until such time as the County of Sacramento formally selects a specific scenario.

(b) Additionally, until such time as construction of the runway system improvements is completed, land use compatibility planning and protection shall be provided for the runway system configuration existing at any given point in time. The configuration existing as of the Effective Date of this Compatibility Plan is taken into account herein along with the future scenarios.

(c) It is the intent of the ALUC to update this Compatibility Plan to reflect future Sacramento County-adopted runway system plans and completed construction.

1.3.3. Referral Areas: The Sacramento International Airport Influence Area is divided into two subareas, Referral Area 1 and Referral Area 2. Requirements for referral of Land Use Actions to the ALUC for review differ between these two areas (see Section 1.4). Map 1, Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area depicts the limits of each of the two referral areas.

(a) Referral Area 1 encompasses locations where noise and/or safety represent compatibility concerns. Areas within the FAA-defined 10,000-foot separation distance for wildlife attractants are also encompassed within Referral Area 1 (see Policy 3.4.3).

(b) Referral Area 2 includes locations where airspace protection (other than wildlife hazards) and/or overflight are compatibility concerns, but not noise or safety.

1.4. Limitations of this Compatibility Plan

1.4.1. Airport Operations: In general, neither the ALUC nor this Compatibility Plan have authority over the planning and design of on-airport facilities or over Airport operations including where and when aircraft fly, the types of aircraft flown, and other aspects of aviation. Exceptions to this limitation are as follows:

(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 Policy 1.5.5).8

(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 Policy 1.5.4(c)).

1.4.2. Existing Land Uses: The policies of this Compatibility Plan do not apply to Existing Land Uses.9 A land use is considered to be “existing” when one or more of the below conditions has been met prior to the adoption date of the Compatibility Plan by the ALUC.

---

7 This is an explicit limitation of state law under Public Utilities Code Section 21674(e).
8 See Public Utilities Code Sections 21676(c) and 21664.5.
9 This is an explicit limitation of Public Utilities Code Sections 21670(a) and 21674(a).
(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 in one or more of the following manners:

1. A tentative parcel or subdivision map has been approved and not expired;
2. A vesting tentative parcel or subdivision map has been approved;
3. A development agreement has been approved and remains in effect;
4. A final subdivision map has been recorded;
5. A 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 policy means that the use no longer qualifies as existing and, therefore, is subject to ALUC review in accordance with the policies of Section 2.

(c) Expiration of Local Agency Commitment: If a Local Agency’s commitment to a Development Proposal, as set forth in Paragraph (a) of this policy, expires, the proposal will no longer qualify as an Existing Land Use. As such, the proposal shall be subject to the criteria of this Compatibility Plan.

(d) Existing Nonconforming Uses: The ALUC has no ability to reduce or remove Nonconforming or otherwise incompatible Existing Land Uses from the airport environs. However, proposed changes to existing uses (i.e., Reconstruction, Redevelopment) are subject to ALUC review if the changes would result in increased nonconformity with the compatibility criteria (see Policy 4.1.3).

1.4.3. Development by Right:

(a) This Compatibility Plan allows:

1. Construction of a single-family home on a legal lot of record (not a new lot created by a lot split or subdivision) that exists as of the date of adoption of this Compatibility Plan provided the use is permitted by local land use regulations and the home is neither:
   - In Safety Zone 1 (see Map 3); or
   - Within the CNEL 65 dB contour (see Maps 2 and 2a).

2. Construction of a secondary unit as defined by state law.

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 safety criteria indicated in Table 2, Safety 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 3.2.3 and 4.1.1 shall apply to development permitted under this policy.
1.5. **Types of Actions Subject to ALUC Review**

1.5.1. *Land Use Actions for which Referral is Always Mandatory:* Prior to approving any of the following types of *Land Use Actions*, the *Local Agency* (see Policy 1.2.24) always must refer the *Land Use Action* to the *ALUC* for determination of consistency with the *Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*:10

(a) *Local Agency* adoption or approval of any new general or specific plan or any amendment thereto that affects lands within the *Airport Influence Area*.

(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 (1) affects land within the *Airport Influence Area* and (2) involves the types of airport impact concerns listed in Policy 1.3.1(b).

1.5.2. *Interim Mandatory Referral of Major Land Use Actions:* In addition to the actions listed in Policies 1.5.1 and 1.5.5 for which referral to the *ALUC* is always required, referral of certain other actions is mandatory as follows.

(a) *Local Agencies* must refer all *Major Land Use Actions* (see list in Policy 1.5.4) to the *ALUC* for review until such time as:

1. Inland finds that a *Local Agency*’s general plan or specific plan is consistent with the compatibility criteria and other policies presented in Sections 3 and 4 of this chapter of the *Compatibility Plan*; or

2. The *Local Agency* has overruled the *ALUC* determination of inconsistency (see Section 1.6).

(b) Referral of lesser actions of types not included on the *Major Land Use Actions* list is optional.11

1.5.3. *Voluntary Referral of Major Land Use Actions:* After a *Local Agency* has revised its general plan or specific plan to be consistent with this *Compatibility Plan* (see Section 4.2.2) or has overruled the *ALUC*, referral of *Major Land Use Actions* for *ALUC* review is voluntary.12

(a) The *ALUC* requests *Local Agencies* to continue to refer *Major Land Use Actions* as listed in Policy 1.5.4 for informal review and comment. *ALUC* review of these types of *Projects* can serve to enhance their compatibility with *Airport* activity.

(b) The *ALUC Secretary* is authorized on behalf of the *ALUC* to provide comments on *Major Land Use Actions* referred to the *ALUC* on a voluntary basis.

(c) Because the *ALUC* reviews of *Land Use Actions* under these circumstances do not represent formal consistency determinations as is the case with actions referred under Policies 1.5.1 or 1.5.5, *Local Agencies* are not required to adhere to the overruling pro-

---

10 Public Utilities Code Section 21676(b).

11 Under the conditions indicated in Policy 1.5.2(a), state law (Public Utilities Code Section 21676.5(a)) allows ALUCs to require *Local Agencies* to refer all actions, regulations, and permits involving land within an *Airport Influence Area* to the *ALUC* for review. The *ALUC* has opted to reduce this all inclusive list to just *Major Land Use Actions*.

12 Once the conditions indicated in Policy 1.5.2(a) 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*. 
cess if they elect to approve a Project without incorporating design changes or conditions recommended by the ALUC or ALUC Secretary.

1.5.4. Major Land Use Actions: The scope or character of certain Major Land Use Actions, as listed below in Paragraphs (a) through (f), is such that their compatibility with Airport activity is a potential concern. Even though these actions may be basically consistent with the local general plan or specific plan, sufficient detail may not be known to enable a full airport compatibility evaluation at the time that the general plan or specific plan is reviewed. To enable better assessment of compliance with the compatibility criteria set forth herein, ALUC review of these actions may be warranted. If there is uncertainty as to whether an action should be referred to the ALUC for review, Local Agencies should consult with the ALUC Secretary. The circumstances under which ALUC review of these actions is to be conducted are indicated in Policies 1.5.2 and 1.5.3 above.

(a) Actions Affecting Land Uses within Referral Area 1:

(1) Any proposed expansion of the sphere of influence of a city or special district.
(2) Proposed pre-zoning associated with future annexation of land to a city.
(3) Proposed development agreements or amendments to such agreements.
(4) Proposed Residential Development, including land divisions, consisting of 5 or more dwelling units or parcels.
(5) Any discretionary Development Proposal for Projects having a building floor area of 20,000 square feet or greater unless only ministerial approval (e.g., a building permit) is required.
(6) Any discretionary Development Proposal for Projects expected to attract more than 100 people (including employees, customers/visitors) to outdoor activities to the Project site during a typical busy period.
(7) Major infrastructure or other capital improvements (e.g., water, sewer, or roads) that would promote urban uses in undeveloped or agricultural areas to the extent that such uses are not reflected in a previously reviewed general plan or specific plan.
(8) Any proposal for non-aviation use of land within Safety Zone 1.
(9) Proposed land acquisition by a government entity for any facility (for example, a school or hospital) designed to accommodate more than 100 people during a typical busy period.
(10) Any proposed object (including buildings, poles, antennas, and other structures) having a height that requires review by the Federal Aviation Administration in accordance with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations.
(11) 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 which could be mistaken for Airport lighting;
   ‣ Glare in the eyes of pilots of aircraft using the Airport; and
   ‣ Impaired visibility near the Airport.
(12) Any project having the potential to create a thermal plume extending to an altitude where aircraft fly.
(b) Actions Affecting Land Uses within Referral Area 2: Only the actions listed in Paragraphs (a)(10), (a)(11) and (a)(12) of this policy require referral to the ALUC for review.

(c) Proposed non-aviation development of Airport property if such development has not previously been included in an airport master plan or community general plan reviewed by the ALUC. (See Policy 1.2.11 for definition of aviation-related use.)

(d) Proposed Redevelopment (see Policy 1.2.35) if the Project is of a type listed in Paragraph (a) of this policy.

(e) Any other proposed Land Use Action, as determined by the Local Agency, involving a question of compatibility with Airport activities.

1.5.5. Mandatory Referral of Airport Planning and Development Actions: Prior to approving either of the following types of airport planning and development actions, the County of Sacramento as proprietor of Sacramento International Airport must refer the action to the ALUC for determination of consistency with the Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

(a) Adoption or modification of a master plan for Sacramento International Airport, a public-use airport.13

(b) Any proposal for “expansion” of Sacramento International Airport if such expansion will require an amended Airport Permit from the State of California. As used in the statutes, “expansion” primarily includes construction of a new runway, extension or realignment of an existing runway, or related acquisition of land.14

1.5.6. Submittal of Environmental Documents: The ALUC does not have a formal responsibility to review the environmental document associated with Land Use Actions or Airport actions referred to it for review.

(a) The ALUC authorizes the ALUC Secretary to provide comments on environmental documents submitted to the ALUC for comment.

(b) If an environmental document has been prepared at the time that the Land Use Action or Airport action is referred for review and the document contains information pertinent to the review, then a copy must be included with the referral.

1.6. Overruling the ALUC

1.6.1. ALUC Determination of “Inconsistent”: If the ALUC determines that a proposed Land Use Action, regulation, or permit or a proposed Airport project is inconsistent with this Compatibility Plan, the ALUC must notify the Local Agency and shall indicate the reasons for the inconsistency determination.

1.6.2. Overruling of ALUC by Local Agency:

(a) If a Local Agency wishes to proceed with a proposed Land Use Action, regulation, permit, or Project or Airport project that the ALUC has determined to be inconsistent with the Compatibility Plan, or if the Local Agency wishes to ignore a condition for consisten-

---

13 Public Utilities Code Section 21676(c).
14 Public Utilities Code Section 21664.5.
cy, the Local Agency must overrule the ALUC determination in accordance with the provisions of state law.\footnote{For a Local Agency to overrule the ALUC, that agency must: (1) prepare specific findings that the proposed action is consistent with the purposes of the ALUC statutes as defined in Public Utilities Code Section 21670(a); (2) provide the ALUC and the California Division of Aeronautics a copy of the proposed decision and findings at least 45 days prior to the decision to overrule; (3) hold a public hearing on the matter; (4) take action by a two-thirds vote of the agency’s governing body; and (5) include the comments, if any, received from the ALUC and the Division of Aeronautics in the public record of the final decision to overrule the ALUC. See Public Utilities Code Sections 21676 and 21676.5 for specific procedures for overruling the ALUC. Further guidance is provided in the California Airport Land Use Handbook published by the California Division of Aeronautics (see beginning on page 5-15 of the 2011 edition). Also see Chapter 1 of this Compatibility Plan for a summary of the statutory requirements.}

(b) The overruling process applies only to determinations made by the ALUC, not ones made by the ALUC Secretary in accordance with Policy 2.3.2. Disagreements over determinations made by the ALUC Secretary are first to be appealed to the ALUC. See Policy 2.3.4.

1.6.3. ALUC Comments on Proposed Overruling: The ALUC may provide comments on the proposed overruling decision. The ALUC delegates to the ALUC Secretary the authority to provide comments.

2. ALUC Review Process

2.1. General Requirements

2.1.1. Timing of Project Submittal by Local Agency: The precise timing of the ALUC’s or ALUC Secretary’s review of a proposed Land Use Action may vary depending upon the nature of the specific Project.

(a) Referrals to the ALUC should be made at the earliest reasonable point in time so that the ALUC’s review can be duly considered by the Local Agency prior to when the agency formalizes its actions. Depending upon the type of plan or Project and the normal scheduling of meetings, ALUC review can be completed before, after, or concurrently with review by the local planning commission and other advisory bodies, but must be accomplished before final action by the Local Agency.

(b) Completion of a formal application with the Local Agency is not required prior to a Local Agency’s referral of a proposed Land Use Action to the ALUC. Rather, a Project applicant may request, and the Local Agency may refer, a proposed Land Use Action to the ALUC for early review, so long as the Local Agency is able to provide the ALUC with the Project submittal information for the proposal, as specified and required in Section 2.3.1 of this Compatibility Plan.

2.1.2. Responsibilities for Project Consistency Analysis: The ALUC and Local Agencies are each responsible for analyzing a Project proposal for compliance with the compatibility criteria set forth in this Compatibility Plan.

(a) Local Agency staff may choose to initially evaluate proposed Projects and work with the Project applicant to bring the proposal into compliance with Compatibility Plan criteria. The ALUC Secretary will provide informal input at this stage if requested.
(b) When a proposed Project is formally referred to the ALUC, the ALUC Secretary shall review the proposal to determine if it is consistent with the Compatibility Plan policies. Projects of a type that require a formal consistency determination by the ALUC (those listed in Policy 1.5.1) will be placed on the agenda for action.

(c) Subsequent to when a Local Agency’s general plan and applicable specific plans have been determined by the ALUC to be consistent with the Compatibility Plan, the Local Agency and its staff are responsible for the consistency analysis of Major Land Use Actions. The ALUC Secretary will provide informal input if requested or the Local Agency can voluntarily refer the Land Use Action to the ALUC for a consistency determination. Land Use Actions for which referral to the ALUC is mandatory regardless of the general plan and specific plan consistency status (actions listed in Policy 1.5.1) must continue to be referred for a consistency determination by the ALUC.

(d) The Local Agency and its staff are responsible for ensuring that a development continues to comply with Compatibility Plan criteria on an on-going basis following completion of the Project (Intensity and height limitations in particular).

2.1.3. Public Input: Where applicable, the ALUC shall provide public notice and obtain public input before acting on any plan, regulation, or other land use proposal under consideration.16

2.1.4. Fees: Any applicable review fees as established by the ALUC shall accompany the submittal of actions for ALUC or ALUC Secretary review.17

2.2. Review Process for General Plans, Specific Plans, Zoning Ordinances, and Building Regulations

2.2.1. Required Submittal Information: Copies of the complete text and maps of the plan, ordinance, or regulation proposed for adoption or amendment must be submitted to the ALUC. Any supporting material, such as environmental documents, assessing the proposal’s consistency with the Compatibility Plan should be included. If the amendment is required as part of a proposed Major Land Use Action, then the information listed in Policy 2.3.1 shall also be included to the extent applicable.

2.2.2. Initial ALUC Review of General Plan Consistency: In conjunction with adoption or amendment of this Sacramento International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the ALUC shall review the general plans and specific plans of affected Local Agencies to determine their consistency with the ALUC’s policies.

(a) State law18 requires that, within 180 days of the ALUC’s adoption or amendment of this Compatibility Plan, each Local Agency affected by the plan must amend its general plan and any applicable specific plan(s) to be consistent with the ALUC’s Compatibility Plan or, alternatively, provide required notice, adopt findings, and overrule the ALUC in accordance with statutory requirements.19

---

16 In accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 21675.2(d).
17 Public Utilities Code Section 22671.5(f) allows for ALUCs to charge fees for Project reviews.
18 Government Code Section 65302.3.
19 Public Utilities Code Section 21676(b).
(b) Prior to taking action on a proposed amendment of a general plan or specific plan as necessitated by Paragraph (a) of this policy, the Local Agency must submit a draft of the proposal to the ALUC for review and approval.

(c) In conjunction with its referral of a general plan or specific plan amendment to the ALUC in response to the requirements of Paragraphs (a) and (b) above, a Local Agency must identify areas that it requests the ALUC to consider as Infill in accordance with Policy 4.1.2 if it wishes to take advantage of the Infill policy provisions. The ALUC will include a determination on the Infill as part of its action on the consistency of the general plan and/or applicable specific plan(s).

2.2.3. Subsequent Reviews of Related Land Use Development Proposals: Once a Local Agency’s general plan and applicable specific plans have been made consistent with this Compatibility Plan, or the Local Agency has overruled an ALUC finding of inconsistency regarding those plans, subsequent land use development actions that are consistent both with those local plans and with any related ordinances and regulations also previously reviewed by the ALUC are subject to ALUC review only under the conditions indicated in Policies 1.5.2 and 2.3.7.

2.2.4. ALUC Action Choices: When reviewing a general plan, specific plan, zoning ordinance, or building regulation for consistency with the Compatibility Plan, the ALUC has three choices of action:

(a) Find the plan, ordinance, or regulation consistent with the Compatibility Plan. To make such a finding with regard to a general plan, the conditions identified in Section 4.2.2 must be met.

(b) Find the plan, ordinance, or regulation consistent with the Compatibility Plan, subject to conditions and/or modifications that the ALUC may require. Any such conditions should be limited in scope and described in a manner that allows compliance to be clearly assessed.

(c) Find the plan, ordinance, or regulation inconsistent with the Compatibility Plan. In making a finding of inconsistency, the ALUC shall note the specific conflicts or shortcomings upon which its determination is based.

2.2.5. Response Time: The ALUC must respond to a Local Agency’s request for a consistency determination on a general plan, specific plan, zoning ordinance, or building regulation within 60 days from the date of referral.20

(a) The date of referral is deemed to be the date on which all applicable Project information as specified in Policy 2.2.1 is received by the ALUC Secretary and the ALUC Secretary determines that the application for a consistency determination is complete.

(b) If the ALUC fails to make a determination within the 60-day period, the proposed Land Use Action shall be deemed consistent with the Compatibility Plan.

(c) The 60-day review period may be extended if the referring Local Agency or Project applicant agrees in writing or so states at an ALUC public hearing on the Land Use Action.

(d) Regardless of ALUC action or failure to act, the proposed Land Use Action must comply with other applicable local, state, and federal regulations and laws.

---

20 Public Utilities Code Section 21676(d).
The referring Local Agency shall be notified of the ALUC's action in writing.

2.3. **Review Process for Major Land Use Actions**

2.3.1. **Required Submittal Information:** A proposed Major Land Use Action referred for ALUC (or ALUC Secretary) review shall include the following information to the extent applicable:

(a) Property location data (assessor’s parcel number, street address, subdivision lot number).

(b) An accurately scaled map depicting the Project site location in relationship to the Sacramento International Airport boundary and runways.

(c) A description of the proposed use(s), current general plan and zoning designations, and the type of Land Use Action being sought from the Local Agency (e.g., zoning variance, special use permit, building permit).

(d) A detailed site plan and supporting data showing: site boundaries and size; existing uses that will remain; location of existing and proposed structures, open spaces, and water bodies; ground elevations (above mean sea level) and elevations of tops of structures and trees. Additionally:
   
   (1) For residential uses, an indication of the potential or proposed number of dwelling units per acre (excluding any secondary units as defined by state and local law).
   
   (2) For nonresidential uses, the total floor area for each type of proposed use, the number of auto parking spaces, and, if known, the maximum number of people potentially occupying the total site or portions thereof at any one time.

(e) Identification of any features, during or following construction, that would increase the attraction of birds or cause other wildlife hazards to aircraft operations at the Airport or in its environs (see Policy 3.4.3). Such features include, but are not limited to the following:

   (1) Open water areas.
   
   (2) Sediment ponds, retention basins.
   
   (3) Detention basins that hold water for more than 48 hours.
   
   (4) Artificial wetlands.

(f) Identification of any characteristics that could create electrical interference, confusing or bright lights, glare, smoke, or other electrical or visual hazards to aircraft flight.

(g) Any environmental document (initial study, draft environmental impact report, etc.) that may have been prepared for the Project.

(h) Staff reports regarding the Project.

(i) Other relevant information that the ALUC or ALUC Secretary determine to be necessary to enable a comprehensive review of the proposed Land Use Action.

2.3.2. **Review by ALUC Secretary:** The ALUC delegates to the ALUC Secretary the review and consistency determination of Major Land Use Actions referred on a mandatory basis under Policy 1.5.2 or on a voluntary basis under Policy 1.5.3. In reviewing these actions, the ALUC Secretary shall:
(a) Consult with the manager of Sacramento International Airport on Land Use Actions within the Airport Influence Area.

(b) Provide to the ALUC, at its next regular meeting, a list of all Projects reviewed and the determination made.

2.3.3. ALUC Secretary’s Choices: The ALUC Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the ALUC, to make consistency determinations on Major Land Use Actions reviewed in accordance with Policy 1.5.2. Such determinations shall be made in writing and shall describe the consistency analysis and the basis for the determination. The ALUC Secretary may opt to forward complex or controversial actions to the ALUC for a consistency determination. For actions not forwarded to the ALUC, the ALUC Secretary has three choices of action:

(a) Find the Project consistent with the Compatibility Plan.

(b) Find the Project consistent with the Compatibility Plan, subject to compliance with such conditions as the ALUC Secretary may specify. Any such conditions should be limited in scope and described in a manner that allows compliance to be clearly assessed (e.g., the height of a structure).

(c) Find the Project inconsistent with the Compatibility Plan. In making a finding of inconsistency, the ALUC Secretary shall note the specific conflicts upon which the determination is based.

2.3.4. Appeal of ALUC Secretary’s Action: The affected Local Agency, Project applicant, the County of Sacramento as Airport owner, or other directly interested party may appeal to the ALUC a consistency determination made by the ALUC Secretary on a Major Land Use Action reviewed in accordance with Policy 1.5.2. The ALUC shall then review the proposed Land Use Action, the ALUC Secretary’s determination, and information supporting the appeal and make a final determination regarding the proposed Land Use Action’s consistency with the Compatibility Plan. Any appeal of the ALUC Secretary’s determination must be submitted within 30 days of the date when the determination was issued.

2.3.5. ALUC Action Choices: When reviewing appealed Major Land Use Actions, the ALUC has the same three action choices provided for the ALUC Secretary in Policy 2.3.3.

2.3.6. Response Time: In responding to Major Land Use Actions referred for review, the policy of the ALUC is that:

(a) When a Major Land Use Action is referred for review on a mandatory basis as required by Policy 1.5.2:

(1) The date of referral is deemed to be the date on which all applicable Project information as specified in Policy 2.3.1 is received by ALUC Secretary and the ALUC Secretary determines that the application for a consistency determination is complete.

(2) Reviews by the ALUC Secretary shall be completed within 30 days of the date of referral.
(3) Reviews of Projects appealed to the ALUC for a consistency determination shall be completed within 60 days of the date of the appeal.21

(4) If the ALUC Secretary or the ALUC fail to make a determination within the above time periods, the proposed Land Use Action shall be deemed consistent with the Compatibility Plan.

(b) When a Major Land Use Action is referred on a voluntary basis in accordance with Policy 1.5.3, review by the ALUC Secretary and/or the ALUC should be completed in a timely manner enabling the comments to be considered by decision-making bodies of the referring Local Agency.

(c) Regardless of action or failure to act on the part of the ALUC Secretary or the ALUC, the proposed Land Use Action must comply with other applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

(d) The referring Local Agency shall be notified of the ALUC Secretary’s and/or the ALUC’s action in writing.

2.3.7. Subsequent Reviews of Related Land Use Development Proposals: Once a Project has been found consistent with the Compatibility Plan, it generally need not be referred for review at subsequent stages of the planning process (e.g., for a use permit after a zoning change has been reviewed). However, additional ALUC review is required if any of the following are true:

(a) At the time of the original ALUC review, the Project information available was only sufficient to determine consistency with compatibility criteria at a planning level of detail, not at the Project design level. For example, the proposed land use designation indicated in a general plan, specific plan, or zoning amendment may have been found consistent, but information on site layout, maximum Intensity limits, building heights, and other such factors that may also affect the consistency determination for a Project may not have yet been known.

(b) The design of the Project subsequently changes in a manner that affects previously considered compatibility issues and could raise questions as to the validity of the earlier finding of consistency. The ALUC will defer to the Local Agency’s judgment; however, proposed changes warranting a new review include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) For residential uses, any increase in the number of dwelling units;

(2) For nonresidential uses, a change in the types of proposed uses, any increase in the total floor area, and/or a change in the allocation of floor area among different types of uses in a manner that could result in an increase in the Intensity of use (more people on the site) to a level exceeding the criteria set forth in this Compatibility Plan;

(3) Any increase in the height of structures or other design features such that the height limits established herein would be exceeded or exceeded by a greater amount;

21 For Major Land Use Actions, this 60-day limit is not a statutory requirement, but is set by the ALUC to be consistent with Policy 2.2.5 and Public Utilities Code Section 21676(d) regarding general plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, and building regulations.
(4) Major site design changes (such as incorporation of clustering or modifications to the configuration of open land areas proposed for the site) if site design was a factor in the initial Project review;

(5) Any significant change to a proposed Project for which a special exception was granted in accordance with Policy 4.1.5;

(6) Any new design features that would create visual hazards (e.g., certain types of lights, sources of glare, and sources of dust, steam, or smoke);

(7) Any new equipment or features that would create electronic hazards or cause interference with aircraft communications or navigation; and/or

(8) Addition of features that could attract wildlife that is potentially hazardous to aircraft operations.

c) At the time of original ALUC review, conditions were placed on the Project that require subsequent ALUC review.

d) The local jurisdiction concludes that further review is warranted.

2.4. Review Process for Airport Master Plans and Development Plans

2.4.1. Required Submittal Information: A Sacramento International Airport master plan or development plan referred to the ALUC for review shall contain sufficient information to enable the ALUC to adequately assess the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts of Airport activity upon surrounding land uses.

(a) When a new or amended master plan is the subject of the ALUC review, the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts should be addressed in the plan report and/or in an accompanying environmental document. Proposed changes in Airport facilities and usage that could have land use compatibility implications should be noted.

(b) For Airport development plans, the relationship to a previously adopted master plan or other approved plan for the Airport should be indicated—specifically, whether the proposed development implements an adopted/approved plan or represents an addition or change to any such previous plan. Any environmental document prepared for the Project should be included in the submittal.

(c) For either airport master plans or development plans, the following specific information should be included to the extent applicable:

(1) A layout plan drawing of the proposed facility or improvements showing the location of:
   ‣ Property boundaries;
   ‣ Runways or helicopter takeoff and landing areas;
   ‣ Runway or helipad protection zones; and
   ‣ Aircraft or helicopter approach/departure flight routes.

(2) A revised map of the Airspace Protection Surfaces as defined by Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 if the proposal would result in changes to these surfaces. Maps reflecting the current and future configurations of the Sacramento International Airport Airspace Protection Surfaces are included in Section 3.4 of this chapter.
(3) Updated activity forecasts, including the number of operations by each type of aircraft proposed to use the facility, the percentage of day versus night operations, and the distribution of takeoffs and landings for each runway direction. The effects of the proposed development on the forecast Airport usage indicated in Chapter 3 of this Compatibility Plan should be described.

(4) Proposed flight track locations and projected noise contours. Differences from the flight track data and noise contours presented in Chapter 3 of this Compatibility Plan should be described.

(5) A map showing existing and planned land uses in the areas affected by aircraft activity associated with implementation of the proposed master plan or development plan.

(6) Identification and proposed mitigation of impacts on surrounding land uses to the extent that those impacts would be greater than indicated by the Policy Maps included in this chapter.

2.4.2. ALUC Action Choices for Airport Plans: When reviewing a proposed new or revised airport master plan or new development plans for Sacramento International Airport, the ALUC has three action choices (see Section 4.4 for policies pertaining to the substance of the ALUC review of Airport plans):

(a) Find the Airport plan consistent with the Compatibility Plan.

(b) Find the Airport plan consistent with the Compatibility Plan with the condition that the Compatibility Plan be modified to reflect the assumptions and proposals of the Airport plan.

(c) Find the Airport plan inconsistent with the Compatibility Plan.

2.4.3. Response Time: The ALUC must respond to the referral of an airport master plan or development plan within 60 days from the date of referral.\(^{22}\)

(a) The date of referral is deemed to be the date on which all applicable Project information as specified in Policy 2.4.1 is received by ALUC Secretary and the ALUC Secretary determines that the application for a consistency determination is complete.

(b) If the ALUC fails to make a determination within the specified period, the proposed Land Use Action shall be deemed consistent with the Compatibility Plan.

(c) Regardless of ALUC action or failure to act, the proposed Land Use Action must comply with other applicable local, state, and federal regulations and laws.

(d) The County of Sacramento, as Airport owner, shall be notified of the ALUC's action in writing.

\(^{22}\) Public Utilities Code Section 21676(d).
3. **Compatibility Criteria**

3.1. **Evaluating Land Use Consistency**

3.1.1. *Evaluating Compatibility of New Development:* The compatibility of proposed land uses within Sacramento International Airport Influence Area shall be evaluated in accordance with:

(a) The specific noise, safety, airspace protection, overflight, and other compatibility policies set forth in Sections 3.2 through 3.5 and in Section 4;

(b) The criteria listed in **Table 1, Noise Compatibility Criteria**, and **Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria**, and

(c) The Compatibility Zones depicted on the Compatibility Policy Maps in this chapter.

3.1.2. *Compatibility Criteria Tables:* **Table 1, Noise Compatibility Criteria**, and **Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria**, list general land use categories and indicate each use as being either “normally compatible,” “conditionally compatible,” or “incompatible” depending upon the noise and safety Compatibility Zones in which it is located. These three compatibility determinations are defined in Policies 3.2.1 and 3.3.1 as well as in the respective criteria tables.

(a) When evaluating a proposed development, each component land use category (e.g., agriculture, industrial, office) of a Project shall be evaluated as a separate development and shall individually satisfy the criteria for the respective land use category in the noise and safety criteria tables.

(b) Land uses not specifically listed in the noise and safety criteria tables shall be evaluated using the criteria for similar listed uses.

3.2. **Noise Compatibility**

**Noise Policy Background Information:**

The following Noise Policy Background Information (in different typeface) has been considered in formulating the Noise Compatibility policies and criteria in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only and does not itself constitute ALUC policy. For additional discussion of noise compatibility concepts, see Appendix D.

**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 noise contours depict the greatest annualized noise impact, measured in terms of CNEL, which is anticipated to be generated by the aircraft operating at the Airport over the planning time frame.

The noise contours included in **Map 2, Compatibility Policy Map: Noise** are based upon contours adopted by the County of Sacramento for land use planning purposes within unincorporated areas of the county. These contours reflect a “Theoretic Capacity” level of Airport activity extending beyond the minimum 20-
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year time frame that state law requires be utilized in compatibility plans (see description and data in Chapter 3). The contours in Map 2 have been adjusted from the Theoretic Capacity contours adopted by Sacramento County to take into account both of the contemplated future runway system configuration scenarios. The contours are a composite set of contours comprised of the highest noise exposure associated with the two future runway scenarios at any given location.

Factors Considered in Setting Noise Compatibility Criteria
Factors considered in setting the criteria 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. 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.)

3.2.1. Evaluating Noise Compatibility for New Development: The noise compatibility of proposed land uses within the influence area of Sacramento International Airport shall be evaluated in accordance with the policies set forth in this section, including the criteria listed in Table 1, Noise Compatibility Criteria and the noise exposure contours depicted on Map 2, Compatibility Policy Map: Noise.

(a) The criteria in Table 1 indicate the maximum acceptable Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) exposure for new residential land uses and a range of nonresidential land uses. Within the various noise exposure ranges, each land use type is shown as being either “normally compatible,” “conditional,” or “incompatible.”

(b) “Normally Compatible” means that the proposed land use shall be presumed to be acceptable within locations having the indicated noise exposure.

(1) Indoor uses are “normally compatible” if either: they involve activities that are inherently noisy; or, standard construction methods will sufficiently attenuate exterior noise to an acceptable indoor CNEL. For land use types that are compatible because of noise levels inherent with the activity, sound attenuation must be provided for associated office, retail, and other noise-sensitive indoor spaces sufficient to reduce exterior noise to an interior maximum of CNEL 50 dB.

(2) Outdoor uses are “normally compatible” if the activities associated with the land use may be carried out with minimal interference from aircraft noise at the indicated CNEL.
(c) “Conditional” means that the conditions indicated in Table 1 must be satisfied in order for the proposed land use to be acceptable.

1. Indoor uses must have building structures that are capable of attenuating exterior noise from all noise sources to the indoor CNEL indicated by the number in the cell.

2. The acceptability of outdoor uses is dependent upon characteristics of the specific use. Caution should be exercised with regard to Noise-Sensitive Outdoor Land Uses because these uses are likely to be disrupted by aircraft noise events. This caution is directed at the Project proponent and is not intended to preclude approval of the Project.

(d) “Incompatible” means that the proposed land use shall not be allowed under any circumstances except as noted in Paragraph (3) below.

1. Indoor uses would have unacceptable noise levels if windows are open. At exposures above CNEL 65 dB, extensive mitigation techniques would be required to make the indoor environment acceptable for performance of activities associated with the land use even with windows closed.

2. Outdoor uses would be exposed to severe noise interference that would prevent performance of activities associated with the land use.

3. Exceptions to an “incompatible” designation may only be made if site-specific special conditions exist. See Policy 4.1.5.

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

(a) Residential Development and Children’s Schools:

1. All new Residential Development and children’s schools are deemed incompatible within the projected CNEL 60 dB contour of Sacramento International Airport.

2. Map 2, Compatibility Policy Map: Noise depicts the area within which this restriction applies.

3. Where special circumstances exist and special measures are taken to address the adverse consequences, exceptions to the CNEL 60 dB criterion are provided for in this Compatibility Plan as described in Section 4.2.

4. Exceptions are also provided for existing residential lots. See Policy 1.4.3.

(b) Nonresidential Development: New Nonresidential Development is deemed incompatible in locations where the airport-related noise exposure would be highly disruptive to the specific land use. Applicable criteria are indicated in Table 1.

3.2.3. **Maximum Acceptable Interior Noise Levels:** To the extent that the criteria in Table 1 and other policies herein permit the development, land uses for which interior activities may be easily disrupted by noise shall be required to comply with the following interior noise level criteria.

(a) The maximum, aircraft-related, interior noise level that shall be considered acceptable for land uses near airports is:

1. CNEL 45 dB in:
   - Any habitable room of single- or multi-family residences
   - Children’s schools (K-12)
2. Libraries
   ▸ Long-term lodging (e.g., dormitories), congregate care facilities, and nursing homes
   ▸ Hotels, motels, and other short-term lodging;
   ▸ Hospitals;
   ▸ Adult educational and institutional facilities;
   ▸ Places of worship, meeting halls, theaters, and mortuaries; and
   ▸ Miscellaneous other uses as listed in Table 1, Noise Compatibility Criteria.

(2) CNEL 50 dB in:
   ▸ Offices and office areas of industrial facilities and research and development facilities;
   ▸ Retail centers and stores; and
   ▸ Personal and miscellaneous services.

(b) The noise contours depicted in Map 2 shall be used in calculating compliance with these criteria. The calculations should assume that windows are closed.

(c) When a proposed building lies within multiple CNEL range zones (e.g., partly in 60-65 dB and partly in 65-70 dB), the higher range zone shall apply for the purposes of determining sound attenuation requirements unless less than 25% of the building floor area is within that zone. In such case, the lower range zone may be used.

(d) Where Table 1 indicates that buildings associated with a particular land use must be capable of attenuating exterior noise to the specified maximum interior noise level, acoustical data documenting that the structure will be designed to comply with the criterion shall be provided to the Local Agency as part of the building permit process. The Local Agency shall be responsible for assuring compliance.

(e) Exceptions to the interior noise level criteria in Paragraph (a) of this policy may be allowed where evidence is provided that the indoor noise generated by the use itself exceeds the listed criteria.

3.2.4. Avigation Easement Dedication Requirements: Dedication of an Avigation Easement is required as a condition for approval of certain proposed development situated within the CNEL 60 dB contour in accordance with Policy 4.1.1 (see Maps 2 and 5).

3.3. Safety Compatibility

Safety Policy Background Information
The following Safety Policy Background Information (in different typeface) has been considered in formulating the Safety Compatibility policies and criteria in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only does not itself constitute ALUC policy. For additional discussion of safety compatibility concepts, see Appendix D.

Policy Objective
The intent of land use safety compatibility criteria 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 3.4).
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: the likelihood of an accident occurring in a given location near the Airport; and the potential consequences if an accident occurs in that location.

- 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 types and patterns of aircraft use at the individual airport. This methodology, as further described in Appendix D, is used to delineate the safety zones depicted in Map 3, Compatibility Policy Map: Safety.

- 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 Criteria

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

- 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 transport (air carrier) and general aviation accident data and analyses contained in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. Department of Defense guidance regarding accident potential zones for military aircraft is considered as well.

- Handbook guidance is also used to delineate the safety zone boundaries for the Airport as depicted on Map 3, Compatibility Policy Map: Safety. The zone shapes and sizes reflect the existing and future runway length, approach categories, aircraft fleet mix, and normal flight patterns for the Airport. Specific factors considered in adjusting the generic Handbook zones to reflect the conditions at the Airport are indicated on the Safety Compatibility Factors map in Chapter 3.

- Handbook guidance regarding the maximum usage intensities (people per acre) considered acceptable is used for new development near airport runways.

- 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.

3.3.1. Evaluating Safety Compatibility for New Development: The safety compatibility of proposed land uses within the influence area of Sacramento International Airport shall be evaluated in accordance with the policies set forth in this section, including the criteria listed in Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria, and the safety zones depicted on Map 3, Compatibility Policy Map: Safety.
(a) The criteria in Table 2 indicate whether a particular type of land use is “normally compatible,” “conditional,” or “incompatible” with the exposure to Sacramento International Airport aircraft accident risks.

(b) “Normally Compatible” means that the proposed Land Use Action is presumed to comply with the indicated Intensity limits and other criteria for the zone. However, atypical examples of a use may require review to ensure compliance with the criteria.

(c) “Conditional” means that the proposed Land Use Action must comply with the conditions listed in the table.

(d) “Incompatible” means that proposed Land Use Action shall not be permitted under any normal circumstances within the indicated safety zone. Limited exceptions are possible for site-specific special conditions. See Policy 4.1.5.

3.3.2. Residential Development Criteria: Proposed Residential Development shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

(a) The Density of Residential Development shall be measured in terms of dwelling units per acre. The maximum allowable Densities in each safety zone are as follows. Exceptions are provided for existing single-family homes and residential lots (see Policy 1.4.3).

1. Within Safety Zones 1, 2, and 5 new Residential Development shall be prohibited.

2. Within Safety Zones 3 and 4, new Residential Development shall be limited to a maximum Density of 1 dwelling unit per 10.0 acres (0.1 dwelling units per acre). Further, the dwelling itself shall not be located within the Safety Zones 3 or 4 boundaries.

3. Within Safety Zone 6, new Residential Development shall be restricted to a sitewide average Density of no greater than 12.0 dwelling units per acre (i.e., the gross acreage of the project site).23

(b) For Projects that are solely residential, the acreage evaluated equals the Project site size which may include multiple parcels. See Policy 3.3.8 with regard to mixed-use development.

(c) 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 in Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria.

(d) Secondary units, as defined by state and local law, shall be excluded from Density calculations.

(e) See Policy 1.4.3 regarding Residential Development by right on existing legal lots of record.

(f) 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.

23 Note that the noise compatibility criteria in Section 3.2 also restrict Residential Development in within part of this Safety Zone.
(g) See Policy 3.3.9(a) for limitations on clustering of development within a single acre and Policy 4.1.2 for Infill criteria.

3.3.3. Nonresidential Development Criteria: Proposed Nonresidential Development shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

(a) The usage Intensity (people per acre) limit indicated in Table 2 for each safety zone is the fundamental criterion against which the safety compatibility of most nonresidential land uses shall be measured. The Intensity limits set the total number of occupants allowed on the Project site during normal busy use. Other criteria may be applicable to uses of special concern (see Policy 3.3.7).

(b) All nonresidential uses, including uses listed in Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria, as “Normally Compatible,” must comply with both the “sitewide average” and “single-acre” usage Intensity limits indicated below and listed in Table 2 for each safety zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Zone</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People per Acre</td>
<td>Maximum Sitewide Average Intensity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Single-Acre Intensity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).

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.

(c) 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 2 as “Normally Compatible” for a particular safety zone are presumed to meet the Intensity criteria indicated in the Paragraph (b) table. Unless the particular Project proposal represents an atypical example of the usage type, calculation of the usage Intensity is not required.

2. Calculation of the usage Intensity must be done for all proposed Projects where the land use category for the particular safety zone is indicated in Table 2 as “Conditional” and the criteria column says “Ensure Intensity criteria are met.”

3. Where Table 2 indicates that land use category is “Conditional” for the particular safety zone, but the criteria are other than “Ensure Intensity criteria are 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 safety zone.

(d) No new structures intended to be occupied regularly are allowed in Safety Zone 1.

(e) Usage Intensity calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors) who may be on the Project site at any single point in time, whether indoors or outdoors.
(1) For the purposes of these calculations, the total number of occupants during normal busiest periods shall be used.\textsuperscript{24}

(2) The Project site may be composed of multiple parcels.

(f) Each component use within a Nonresidential Development that has multiple types of uses shall comply with the safety criteria in Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria, unless the use is ancillary to the primary use.

(1) To be considered 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) Ancillary Uses must be considered in the sitewide average Intensity limits, but may be excluded from the single-acre Intensity calculations.

(3) 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;
   - A K-12 school, day care center, or other risk-sensitive use that is “incompatible” within the safety zone where the primary use is to be located.

(g) Other criteria may be applicable to uses of special concern (see Policy 3.3.7 and conditions in Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria).

(h) Local Agencies may make exceptions for “Conditional” or “Incompatible” land uses associated with 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.

3.3.4. Methodology for Determining Compliance with Sitewide Average Intensity Criteria: Determination of compliance with the sitewide average Intensity criteria indicated in Policy 3.3.3(b) requires calculating the total occupancy of the site at any given time under normal busy use (see Policy 3.3.3(e)), then dividing by the total acreage of the Project site (see Exhibit 1). Alternatively, the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) criteria indicated in Table 2 for most nonresidential uses may be used. Additional guidance is found in Appendix E. Regardless of the method or methods used, the proposed Project’s compliance with the Intensity criteria in Policy 3.3.3(b) must be demonstrated by the applicant or referring Local Agency.

(a) Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Criteria: Where a floor area ratio limit is cited in Table 2 as the condition to be met, the indicated numbers should be treated as a tool by which compliance with the usage Intensity criteria can be evaluated.

(1) The limit listed for each use is based upon a typical Occupancy Load Factor (floor area square footage per person) for that use. The allowable FAR in a particular safety zone thus varies from one land use category to another. The assumed Occupancy Load Factors are shown in the table.

\textsuperscript{24} 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) If a higher or lower Occupancy Load Factor can be documented for a particular Project (see Paragraph (b) 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.

(b) Alternative Methodologies for Calculation of Sitewide Average Usage Intensities: Application of the FAR methodology for determining compliance with usage Intensity criteria is not required. Usage intensities may also be determined by first calculating the total occupancy of the site. The following methods may be used to determine the total occupancy for any category of use. For Projects involving multiple nonresidential land
use categories, the occupancy for each use must be calculated separately, then added to produce the total occupancy. See Policy 3.3.8 for criteria pertaining to mixed-use Projects having both residential and nonresidential components.

(1) Fixed Seating: For uses with fixed seats, such as restaurants and theaters, the occupancy should be based upon the number of customer seats plus the number of employees.

(2) Occupancy Load Factors: The square footage of the building divided by the typical square footage occupied by each person yields the total occupancy. Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria, lists typical occupancy load factors for various land use categories.

(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 (see Appendix E).

(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 some factor—approximately one half for most uses—to provide a number consistent with the Intensity limits listed in Policy 3.3.3(b).

(c) Projects Containing Mixed Nonresidential Uses: Where a proposed development will contain a mixture of the nonresidential uses listed separately in Table 2, the FAR values cannot be directly used as an evaluation tool unless each component use is to be situated on its own distinct site. Instead, it is necessary to apply the occupancy load factors or use other information to calculate the total number of occupants expected within the overall development. This number is then used to determine compliance with the usage Intensity criteria.

(1) See Policy 3.3.8 for mixed residential/nonresidential uses.

(2) See Policy 3.3.11 with regard to criteria for Project sites that occupy two or more safety zones.

(d) Selection of Calculation Method: When evaluating Major Land Use Actions referred for ALUC review on a mandatory basis in accordance with Policy 1.5.2, the ALUC shall normally use the Floor Area Ratio methodology (Paragraph (a) of this policy). Occupancy within a single acre shall normally be calculated as described in Policy 3.3.5. However, the ALUC shall consider usage Intensity data that the Local Agency or Project applicant has provided for the Project using an alternative calculation method.

(1) If the Local Agency or Project applicant provides definitive information that a particular Development Proposal is atypical—that is, there would be more floor area per person and thus a lower usage Intensity—the ALUC may consider that information in determining the safety compatibility of the proposal. In considering any such exceptions, the ALUC shall also take into account the potential for the use of a building to change over time (see Policy 3.3.6).
(2) In conjunction with modifying its general plan for consistency with this Compatibility Plan or as part of a separate ordinance or other adopted policy, a Local Agency may propose a particular method for measuring compliance with the usage Intensity limits.\(^2\) The ALUC shall evaluate the proposed method to determine whether it would provide an equivalent Intensity outcome to that of the floor area ratio method. Once the ALUC has determined that the general plan is consistent with this Compatibility Plan, referral of Major Land Use Actions to the ALUC becomes voluntary. Therefore, subject to ALUC acceptance of the alternative calculation method, the Local Agency may then use that method when internally reviewing individual development Projects for compliance with the usage Intensity criteria.

3.3.5. 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.

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) 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 the occupants of that area shall be included in the single-acre calculation.

(d) 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.

3.3.6. Long-Term Changes in Occupancy: In evaluating compliance of a proposed Nonresidential Development with the usage Intensity criteria, the ALUC 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 provide 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.)

\(^2\) For example, a method based upon the Local Agency’s parking space requirements may be used together with an assumed number of people per vehicle as a means of determining the number of occupants for uses that are vehicle oriented.
3.3.7. **Land Uses of Special Concern:** Certain types of land uses represent special safety concerns irrespective of the number of people associated with those uses.

(a) Land uses of particular concern and the nature of the concern are:

1. **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. The primary uses in this category are:
   - Children’s schools (grades K–12).
   - Day care centers (facilities with 15 or more children, as defined in the California Health and Safety Code).
   - 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. **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. 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.

3. **Critical Community Infrastructure:** This category pertains to facilities the damage or destruction of which would cause significant adverse effects to public health and welfare well beyond the immediate vicinity of the facility. 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, and renewable energy power plants, electrical substations, and other utilities.

(b) The safety criteria for the land uses in Paragraph (a) of this policy are included in Table 2, *Safety Compatibility Criteria*. These criteria shall be applied when evaluating these uses.

1. In some cases, these uses are not allowed in portions of the Airport environs regardless of the number of occupants associated with the use.

2. In other instances these uses should be avoided (that is, allowed only if a site outside the zone would not serve the intended function).

3. When allowed, special measures for the particular use, such as those listed in Table 2, *Safety Compatibility Criteria*, must be taken as appropriate to minimize hazards to the facility and occupants if the facility were to be struck by an aircraft.

3.3.8. **Mixed-Use 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. 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. 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 Development is proposed to be located in conjunction with Nonresidential Development in the same or nearby buildings on the same site must meet both residential Density and nonresidential Intensity criteria. The number of dwelling units shall not exceed the Density limits indicated in Table 2, Safety Compatibility Criteria. Additionally, the normal occupancy 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 2.

(c) Mixed-use development shall not be allowed where the residential component would be exposed to noise levels above the limits set in Table 1, Noise Compatibility Criteria.

3.3.9. Limits on Clustering: As used in this Compatibility Plan, “clustering” refers to the concentration of development (measured in terms of dwellings or people per acre) into a portion of the site, leaving other portions of the site relatively less developed or as open land. To a degree, clustering of development can be desirable from an airport land use safety compatibility perspective if more places where an aircraft can attempt an emergency landing potentially remain. However, clustering can pose greater risks that an aircraft could strike the location where the development is clustered. To guard against this risk, limitations on the maximum concentrations of dwellings or people in a small area of a large Project site are appropriate.

(a) Clustering of new Residential Development in the Sacramento International Airport environs is limited as follows:

1. Clustering is not applicable in Safety Zones 1, 2, and 5 as new Residential Development is not permitted in these zones.

2. In Safety Zones 3 and 4, up to 2 dwellings may be built in a single acre area, provided that the average Density of the development does not exceed 1 dwelling unit per 10.0 acres. Where new Residential Development is allowed as Infill in these zones, the single-acre Density shall not exceed that typical of the surrounding development and in no case shall exceed 8 dwelling units per acre.

3. There is no limit on site-wide or single-acre residential Densities in Safety Zone 6.

(b) For nonresidential land uses, the usage Intensity on a single 1.0-acre portion of a Project site shall not exceed the limits specified in Table 2.

(c) For the purposes of the above policies, the 1.0-acre areas to be evaluated shall be rectangular (reasonably close to square, not elongated or irregular) in shape.

3.3.10. Lot Coverage Limits: In addition to the single-acre Density and Intensity limits set by Policy 3.3.9, new residential and Nonresidential Development shall also be limited with respect to lot coverage—the percentage of the Project site covered by buildings. The specific limits for each safety zone are as shown in Table 2.
3.3.11. Parcels Lying within Two or More Safety Zones: For the purposes of evaluating consistency with the compatibility criteria set forth in Table 2, any parcel that is split by safety zone boundaries shall be considered as if it were multiple parcels divided at the safety zone boundary line (see Exhibit 2).

Exhibit 2: Site Split by Safety Zones

In this example, the restaurant and office uses are split between Safety Zones 4 and 6. When determining compliance with the Zone 4 Intensity limits, only the portions of the uses in Zone 4, together with the retail use that is fully in Zone 4 are considered and the site size is the 3.5 acres in Zone 4.

Safety Zone 4
Retail: 50,000 s.f. = 294 people
170 s.f. per person
Restaurant: 50% of 18,000 s.f. = 150 people
60 s.f. per person
Office: 50% of 24,000 s.f. = 56 people
215 s.f. per person
Total Occupancy = 500 people
Intensity: 500 people = 143 people/acre* 3.5 acres
* Meets Zone 4 sitewide average limit of 160 people/acre

Safety Zone 6
All proposed uses are normally compatible.

(a) The preceding notwithstanding, where no part of the building(s) or areas of outdoor congregation of people proposed on the Project site falls within the more restrictive safety zone, the criteria for the safety zone where the proposed building(s) or outdoor uses are located shall apply.

(b) Modification of the Project site plan so as to transfer the allowed Density of Nonresidential 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 Intensity is permitted even if the resulting Intensity in the less restricted area would then exceed the sitewide average Intensity limits that apply within that safety zone (see Exhibit 3).

(2) The single-acre criterion for the zone to which the use is transferred must still be satisfied.

Exhibit 3: Transferring Usage Intensity

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

Project Site
Zone 3: 1.0 acres
Zone 4: 2.0 acres

Allowable Total Occupancy
Zone 3: 100 people/acre = 100 people
Zone 4: 160 people/acre = 320 people
Total Allowed on Site: 420 people

Transfer People from Zone 3 to Zone 4
Zone 3: 0 people
Zone 4: 320 + 100 = 420 people
* 420 people in 2.0 acres exceeds 160 people/acre limit for Zone 4, but is allowable under usage Intensity transfer policy
3.3.12. **Avigation Easement Dedication Requirements:** Dedication of an *Avigation Easement* is required as a condition for approval of certain proposed development situated within Safety Zones 1 through 5 in accordance with Policy 4.1.1 (see Maps 3 and 5).

### 3.4. Airspace Protection

#### Airspace Protection Policy Background Information

The following Airspace Protection Policy Background Information (in different typeface) has been considered in formulating the Airspace Protection Compatibility policies and criteria in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only and does not itself constitute ALUC policy. For additional discussion of airspace protection concepts, see Appendix D.

#### 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 and certain 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 Criteria

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.

- 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 ALUC policies are intended to help implement the federal and state regulations.

#### Factors Considered in Setting Airspace Protection / Wildlife Hazard Compatibility Criteria

Natural features and agricultural practices near Sacramento International Airport include open water and food sources that are attractive to wildlife, especially waterfowl and other bird species. FAA data indicates that aircraft using the Airport have experienced a high incidence of bird strikes compared to other airports nationwide (see discussion in Appendix F). The *Compatibility Plan* relies upon the wildlife hazard guidelines established by the FAA in the following Advisory Circulars:
3.4.1. Evaluating Airspace Protection / Object Height Compatibility for New Development: The object height compatibility of proposed land uses within the influence area of Sacramento International Airport shall be evaluated in accordance with the policies in this section, including the Airspace Protection Surfaces depicted on Maps 4a, 4b, and 4c, Compatibility Policy Maps: Airspace Protection / Object Heights.

(a) The airspace protection / height limit surfaces are drawn in accordance with FAR Part 77, Subpart C, and reflect the runway lengths, runway end locations, and approach types for each of the three runway configuration scenarios: existing, north-only extension of east runway, and split extension of east runway. Maps 4a, 4b, and 4c depict the approach protection / height limit surfaces for these respective scenarios.

(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.

3.4.2. 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 Federal Aviation Regulations (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 is required as described in Policy 3.4.5, the results of that study shall be taken into account by the ALUC and the Local 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 Sacramento International Airport on Maps 4a, 4b, or 4c. Any object that penetrates one of these surfaces is, by FAA definition, deemed an obstruction.26

(b) Objects not situated within a Critical Airspace Protection Zone (see Policy 3.4.1(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) Unless exempted under Paragraph (b) of this policy, a proposed object having a height that exceeds the Airport’s Airspace Protection Surface shall be allowed only if all of the following apply:

26 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.
(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 SCAS as Airport owner concludes that, despite being an airspace obstruction (not necessarily a hazard), the object 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 diminution 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.27

(4) An Avigation Easement is dedicated, in accordance with Policy 4.1.1, to the County of Sacramento as owner of the Airport.

(5) The proposed Project/plan complies with all policies of this Compatibility Plan related to noise and safety compatibility.

3.4.3. Evaluating Airspace Protection / Wildlife Hazard Compatibility for New Development: The foundation for regulation of land uses that could attract hazardous wildlife on and near airports is set by the federal government.28 The ALUC’s role and policy with regard to regulating wildlife hazards in the Airport environs is limited to new development as well as general plans, specific plans, master plans, and zoning ordinances that set standards for new development. The ALUC has no authority to regulate Existing Land Uses, including agriculture, even if these uses include land use characteristics that attract hazardous wildlife.29

(a) Any proposed Land Use Project that could attract wildlife to the Airport Influence Area is a potential concern. Federal regulations and guidelines referred to above identify specific land uses that the federal government deems incompatible near airports.

(b) Crop selection and other routine agricultural activities that do not involve construction or otherwise constitute a Land Use Project and do not need Local Agency approval are not subject to ALUC authority and are not regulated by the policies of this Compatibility Plan.

(c) For proposed Land Use Projects to be located within 10,000 feet of the Sacramento International Airport Air Operations Area (AOA; see Map 5) and that include a zoning amendment and that could attract hazardous wildlife, the project proponent shall doc-

---

27 Advisory Circular 70/7460-1J, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, or any later FAA guidance.
28 See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 14, Part 139, Certification of Airports, Section 139.337 – Wildlife Hazard Management. FAA policy implementing these regulations is expressed in a variety of documents, but primarily resides in Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports, as periodically amended.
29 See Appendix F for a discussion of wildlife hazards at Sacramento International Airport and the role of the ALUC and SACOG, separate from the policies in this Compatibility Plan, in addressing those hazards.
ument consideration of current FAA or other federal regulations and guidelines pertaining to hazardous wildlife attractants.\footnote{For a detailed description of these uses and design guidelines for minimizing wildlife attraction, see FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, \textit{Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports}, or newer FAA guidance on wildlife attractants.}

(d) Elsewhere within the \textit{Airport Influence Area}, but beyond 10,000 feet from the AOA, or for projects within 10,000 feet from the AOA that do not include a zoning amendment, a formal Project review and compatibility determination by the \textit{ALUC} shall not be required. It is recommended that the project proponent consider current FAA or other federal regulations and guidelines pertaining to hazardous wildlife attractants.\footnote{ibid}

3.4.4. Other Flight Hazards: Land uses that may cause visual or electronic hazards, to aircraft in flight or taking off or landing at the \textit{Airport} shall be allowed within the \textit{Airport Influence Area} only if the uses are consistent with FAA rules and regulations.

(a) Specific characteristics to be avoided, especially within areas beneath the \textit{Airspace Protection Surfaces} (see Map 5), include:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Sources of glare (such as from mirrored or other highly reflective buildings or building features) or bright lights (including search lights and laser light displays);
\item Distracting lights that could be mistaken for airport lights;
\item Sources of dust, steam, or smoke that may impair pilots’ vision;
\item Sources of steam or other emissions that cause thermal plumes or other forms of unstable air; and
\item Sources of electrical interference with aircraft communications or navigation.
\end{enumerate}

(b) To resolve any uncertainties with regard to the significance of the above types of flight hazards, \textit{Local Agencies} should consult with FAA and Sacramento International Airport officials.

3.4.5. \textbf{Requirements for FAA Notification of Proposed Construction or Alteration:} Project proponents are responsible for notifying the FAA about proposed construction that may affect navigable airspace.\footnote{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 includes 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 \textbf{Appendix C} of this \textit{Compatibility Plan} for a copy of FAR Part 77 and online procedures for filing Form 7460-1.) FAA notification is required under the following circumstances:

\begin{enumerate}
\item 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 \textit{Airport Influence Area} depicted on Map 1, \textit{Airport Influence Area}. For Sacramento International Airport, 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.
\item 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.
\end{enumerate}
(a) The boundary of the FAA notification area for Sacramento International Airport is depicted on Maps 4a, 4b, and 4c. Reference to FAA notification requirements is included here for informational purposes only, not as an ALUC policy.

(b) Local Agencies should inform Project proponents 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 submitted to the ALUC for a consistency review in accordance with Policy 1.5.2 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.

3.4.6. ALUC Review: The requirement for notification to the FAA shall not by itself trigger an airport compatibility review of an individual Project by the ALUC. If the general plan of the Local Agency in which the Project is to be located has been determined by the ALUC to be consistent with this Compatibility Plan, then no ALUC review is required. If the general plan has not been made consistent, then the proposed Project must be referred to the ALUC for review if it qualifies as a Major Land Use Action (see Policy 1.5.2).

3.5. Overflight Compatibility

**Overflight Policy Background Information**

The following Overflight Compatibility Policy Background Information (in different typeface) has been considered in formulating the Overflight Compatibility policies and criteria in this section, but is provided for informational purposes only and does not itself constitute ALUC policy. For additional discussion of overflight compatibility concepts, see Appendix D.

**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 3.2. Sensitivity to aircraft overflight varies from one person to another.

The policies in this section serve primarily to establish the form and requirements for notification about airport proximity and aircraft overflight to be given in conjunction with Local Agency approval of new Residential Development and with certain real estate transactions involving existing Residential Development. Overflight policies do not apply to Nonresidential Development.

**Measures of Overflight Exposure**

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 produce significant CNEL contours.

Of particular concern are the areas beneath the flight routes of military aircraft that often conduct flight training at Sacramento International Airport. Although the number of these operations is not high enough to significantly affect the projected cumulative (CNEL) noise contours, these aircraft are very noisy compared to civilian aircraft. This activity is expected to continue indefinitely and the individual noise levels will continue...
to be loud enough to disrupt outdoor activities when the military aircraft fly over. Moreover, the areas affected include locations not regularly flown over by civilian aircraft.

Also of concern are areas beneath the concentrated flight routes of air carrier jet aircraft. Although not as loud as military aircraft, the frequency of these flights can be annoying when outdoor activities are disrupted. Locations where aircraft regularly fly at an altitude of 3,000 feet or less above the ground are considered to be within the overflight impact area of Sacramento International Airport.

**Factors Considered in Setting Overflight Compatibility Criteria**

Factors considered in establishing overflight criteria include the following:

- The boundary of the overflight area for the Airport, as depicted on Map 6, *Compatibility Policy Map: Overflight*, is drawn to encompass locations where aircraft approaching and departing the Airport typically fly at an altitude of less than approximately 3,000 feet above the Airport elevation. 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.

- To be most effective, overflight policies should establish notification requirements for transactions involving *Existing Land Uses*, not just future development. However, the ALUC only has authority to set requirements for new development and to define the boundaries within which airport proximity disclosure in conjunction with real estate transactions should be provided as specified under state law.

- 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.]

3.5.1. **Evaluating Overflight Compatibility:** Unlike the function of the noise, safety, and airspace protection compatibility policies in this *Compatibility Plan*, the overflight compatibility policies set forth in this section do not restrict the manner in which land can be developed or used. The policies in this section serve primarily 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. The boundaries of the overflight zones around Sacramento International Airport are shown on Map 6, *Compatibility Policy Map: Overflight*.

3.5.2. **Recorded Overflight Notification:** As a condition for *Local Agency* discretionary approval of residential land use development within the secondary approach area indicated on Map 6, an overflight notification shall be recorded.

(a) The notification shall be of a format similar to that indicated in Appendix H 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 associ-
ated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

(b) The notification shall be evident to prospective purchasers of the property and shall appear on the property deed.

(c) A separate Recorded Overflight Notification is not required where an Avigation Easement is provided.

(d) Recording of an Overflight Notification is not required for Nonresidential Development.

3.5.3. 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.”

ALUC policy with regard to Airport Proximity Disclosure is as follows:

(a) For existing residences:

(1) State law indicates that the ALUC is responsible for delineating the area within which Airport Proximity Disclosure is appropriate. The recommended Airport Proximity Disclosure area for Sacramento International Airport is identified on Map 6 in this chapter and includes the entire Airport Influence Area.

(2) To the extent that real estate transactions involve existing residences, Airport Proximity Disclosure is a matter between private parties. The ALUC has no authority to mandate that Airport Proximity Disclosure be provided and neither the ALUC nor Local Agencies have any enforcement responsibilities.

(3) Airport Proximity Disclosure should be provided as part of all real estate transactions (sale, lease, or rental) involving 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 ALUC policy even if the state law is made less stringent or rescinded. The disclosure shall be of a format similar to that indicated in Appendix H and shall contain the language dictated by state law (see Policy 3.5.2(a)).

(2) Signs providing the above notice and a map of the Airport Influence Area shall be prominently posted in the real estate sales office and/or other key locations at any new Residential Development within the Airport Influence Area.

3.5.4. Residential Development Suitability: Residential land uses are particularly sensitive to the noise associated with frequent or loud aircraft overflights. These overflight impacts extend to areas beyond the limits of the cumulative noise impacts defined by the CNEL contours that provide the basis for the noise compatibility policies in Section 3.2. At Sacramento International Airport, the most prominent of these impacts is associated with military air-
craft activity in the Traffic Pattern Areas east and west of the Airport. Compatibility Plan policy regarding new Residential Development in these areas is as follows:

(a) Residential Development is not restricted within the Traffic Pattern Area and is not inconsistent with the policies of this Compatibility Plan except as dictated by noise, safety, and airspace protection policies that affect portions of the same area.

(b) To the extent that residential is the most practical land use for the area, multi-family residential—subject to the Density limits set by safety compatibility policies—is preferable to single-family.34

(c) Any new Residential Development within the Traffic Pattern Area shall incorporate sound attenuation features sufficient to ensure an exterior to interior noise level reduction of at least 25 dBA with windows closed.

(d) New Residential Development shall be conditioned upon dedication of an Avigation Easement to the County of Sacramento if required under Policy 4.1.1.

4. Other Compatibility Policies

4.1. Policies for Special Circumstances

4.1.1. Avigation Easement Dedication: As a condition for approval of Projects that are subject to the review provisions of this Compatibility Plan and that meet the conditions in Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this policy, the property owner shall be required to dedicate an Avigation Easement to the County of Sacramento as owner of Sacramento International Airport.

(a) Avigation easement dedication is required for all off-airport Projects situated within the following portions of the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area as depicted on Map 6:

(1) All locations within the Primary Approach Area. This area is comprised of:
   › All locations within the CNEL 60 dB contour depicted on Map 2.
   › All locations within Safety Zones 1 through 5 as depicted on Map 3.
   › All locations within the Critical Airspace Protection Zone as depicted on Maps 4a, 4b, or 4c.

(2) All locations within the Traffic Pattern Area. This area is comprised of:
   › All locations with Safety Zone 6 as depicted on Map 3.
   › Other locations regularly overflown by civilian or military aircraft at an altitude of approximately 2,000 feet or less while approaching, departing, or engaged in flight training at the Airport.

(b) Avigation Easement dedication shall be required for any proposed development, including Infill development, for which discretionary local approval is required. Avigation Easement dedication is not required for ministerial approvals such as building permits. Further, unless previously required prior to the Effective Date of this Compatibility

34 Multi-family residential typically has less outdoor living, fewer outside walls through which noise can intrude, and higher ambient noise levels compared to single-family residential.
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*.

(c) 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 3.4 and *Maps 4a, 4b, or 4c* herein;
4. Permit access to the property for the removal or aeronautical marking of objects exceeding the established height limit (if not accomplished by the property owner, these actions can be taken by the *Airport* at the property owner’s expense); and
5. Prohibit electrical interference, glare, and other potential hazards to flight from being created on the property.

(d) An example of an *Avigation Easement* is provided in *Appendix H*.

4.1.2. 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 new land use is otherwise incompatible with respect to the compatibility criteria for that location.

(a) *Infill* development is not permitted in the following locations.

1. Within Safety Zone 1 (the runway protection zones and within the runway primary surface), *Infill* development is not applicable as this zone is fully contained on *Airport* property.
2. Within Safety Zones 2 through 5, residential *Infill* development shall not be permitted except as allowed by Policy 1.4.3 regarding existing residential parcels.
3. Within the CNEL 65 dB noise contour as depicted on *Map 2*, *Compatibility Policy Map: Noise*, residential *Infill* development shall not be allowed.35

(b) In other locations within *Referral Area 1*, a *Project* site can be considered for *Infill* development if it either:

1. Is part of a cohesive area, defined by the local land use jurisdiction and accepted by the *ALUC*, within which at least 65% of the uses were developed prior to the *Compatibility Plan* adoption with uses not in conformance with the plan; or
2. Meets all of the following conditions:
   - At least 65% of the site’s perimeter is bounded (disregarding roads) by existing (as of the Effective Date of this *Compatibility Plan*) uses similar to, or more intensive than, those proposed;
   - An individual *Project* site within an identified *Infill* area must be no larger than 20 acres;
   - The proposed *Project* would not extend the perimeter of the area defined by the surrounding, already developed, incompatible uses; and

---

35 The effect of this policy is that *Infill Residential Development* is allowed at a 5 dB higher noise level than is the acceptable limit for other new *Residential Development* as set by Policy 3.2.2(a).
Land uses proposed for the Infill area are consistent with the Local Agency’s zoning regulations governing the existing, already developed, surrounding area.

(c) The Density of Infill Residential Development within the CNEL 60 to 65 dB noise contour range as depicted on Map 2, Compatibility Policy Map: Noise shall be limited in accordance with the safety compatibility policies applicable to the Project site.\(^{36}\) To the extent that Infill Residential Development is planned within this Noise Impact Area, multi-family—subject to the Density limits set by safety compatibility policies—is preferred over single-family (see Policy 3.5.4(b)).

(d) For Infill Nonresidential Development, the average usage Intensity (the number of people per acre) of the site’s proposed use shall not exceed the lesser of:

1. The median Intensity of all existing nonresidential uses that lie fully or partially within a distance of 1,000 feet from the boundary of the defined Infill area; or
2. Double the Intensity permitted in accordance with the criteria for that location as indicated in Table 2.

(For example, if the zone allows 100 people per acre and the median of nearby Existing Land Uses is 150 people per acre, the Infill development would be limited to 150 people per acre rather than 200.)

(e) The single-acre Density and Intensity limits described in Policies 3.3.9 and listed in Table 2 are applicable to Infill development. Also, the sound attenuation and Avigation Easement dedication requirements set by Policies 3.2.3 and 4.1.1 shall apply to Infill development.

(f) The ALUC prefers that all parcels eligible for Infill be identified at one time by the Local Agency.

1. The Local Agency is responsible for identifying, in its general plan or other adopted planning document approved by the ALUC, the qualifying locations that lie within that Local Agency’s boundaries. This action may take place in conjunction with the process of amending a general plan for consistency with the ALUC plan or may be submitted by the Local Agency for consideration by the ALUC at the time of initial adoption of this Compatibility Plan.

2. If a map identifying locations suitable for Infill has not been submitted by the Local Agency and approved by the ALUC or the site of an individual Project proposal does not fall within the identified Infill area, the ALUC may evaluate the Project to determine whether it would meet the qualifying conditions listed in Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this policy.

3. In either case, the burden for demonstrating that an area or an individual site qualifies as Infill rests with the affected Local Agency and/or Project proponent and is not the responsibility of the ALUC.

4.1.3. Existing Nonconforming Uses: Proposed changes to Existing Land Uses that are not in conformance with the compatibility criteria in this Compatibility Plan are subject to ALUC review if the changes would result in increased nonconformity with the compatibility criteria. Proposed changes, whether to a parcel or building, are limited as follows:

\(^{36}\) Note that Sacramento County policy prohibits new residential development within the CNEL 60 dB contour.
(a) Residential uses:

1. A Nonconforming residential land use may be continued, sold, leased, or rented without ALUC restriction or review.

2. A Nonconforming single-family dwelling may be maintained, remodeled, reconstructed (see Policy 4.1.4(a)), 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 Policy 1.4.3. 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 and local laws.
   - 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 Policy 4.1.4(a)). The size of individual dwelling units may be increased, but additional dwelling units may not be added.

4. Sound attenuation and Avigation Easement dedication shall be provided where required by Policies 3.2.3 and 4.1.1.

(b) Nonresidential uses (other than children’s schools):

1. A nonconforming nonresidential use may be continued, sold, leased, or rented without ALUC restriction or review.

2. Nonconforming nonresidential facilities may be maintained, altered, or, if required by state law, reconstructed (see Policy 4.1.4). 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 (the number of people per acre) above the levels existing at the time of adoption of this Compatibility Plan.

3. Sound attenuation and Avigation Easement dedication shall be provided where required by Policies 3.2.3 and 4.1.1.

(c) Children’s schools (including grades K-12, day care centers with more than 14 children, and school libraries):

1. Land acquisition for new schools or expansion of existing school sites is not permitted where projected noise impacts exceed CNEL 60 dB (see Map 2) or in Safety Zones 1 through 5.

2. Replacement or expansion of buildings at existing schools is also not allowed in these noise or safety zones, except that one-time expansion accommodating no more than 50 students is permitted where projected noise impacts are between CNEL 60 and 65 dB. This limitation does not preclude work required for normal maintenance or repair.

3. Sound attenuation and Avigation Easement dedication shall be provided where required by Policies 3.2.3 and 4.1.1.

4.1.4. Reconstruction: An existing nonconforming development that has been fully or partially destroyed as the result of a calamity or natural and unavoidable catastrophe, and would oth-
otherwise not be reconstructed but for the calamity or catastrophe, may be rebuilt only under the following conditions:

(a) Single-family or multi-family residential Nonconforming Uses may be rebuilt provided that the Reconstruction does not result in more dwelling units than existed on the parcel at the time of the damage. Addition of a secondary dwelling unit to a single-family residence is permitted if in accordance with state law and local regulations.

(b) A nonresidential Nonconforming Use may be rebuilt provided 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).

(c) Reconstruction under Paragraphs (a) or (b) above:
   (1) Must have a permit application deemed complete by the Local Agency within twelve (12) months of the date the damage occurred.
   (2) Shall incorporate sound attenuation features to the extent required by Policy 3.2.3.
   (3) Shall comply with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 requirements (see Policy 3.4.2).

(d) Reconstruction in accordance with Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this policy shall not be allowed where it would be in conflict (not in conformance) with the general plan or zoning ordinance of the Local Agency.

(e) Nothing in the above policies is intended to preclude work required for normal maintenance and repair.

4.1.5. Special Conditions Exception: The compatibility criteria set forth in this Compatibility Plan are intended to be applicable to all locations within the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area that are under the jurisdiction of the Airport Land Use Commission for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. 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.

(a) After due consideration of all the factors involved in such situations, the ALUC may find a normally incompatible use to be acceptable.

(b) In reaching such a decision, the ALUC shall make specific findings as to the nature of the extraordinary circumstances that warrant the policy exception and why the exception is being made. Findings also shall be made 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.

(c) 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 Secretary for approval.

(d) The burden for demonstrating that special conditions apply to a particular Development Proposal rests with the Project proponent and/or the referring Local Agency, not with the ALUC.

(e) The granting of a special conditions exception shall be considered site specific and shall not be generalized to include other sites.
4.2. Site-Specific Exceptions

4.2.1. General: In adoption of this Compatibility Plan, the ALUC has determined that certain known Projects warrant special conditions treatment as envisioned by Policy 4.1.5. These site-specific exceptions and the criteria to be applied to them are as described in the following policies of this section.

4.2.2. Garden Highway Special Planning Area: The intent of this Compatibility Plan is that it is internally consistent with the Garden Highway Special Planning Area, or SPA (last amended June 2002) of the Sacramento County Zoning Code. Construction or replacement of dwellings on existing parcels or the addition of a secondary dwelling unit, if allowed in accordance with the SPA, is allowed under the Compatibility Plan in accordance with Policy 1.4.3. However, any lot splits or other subdivision of land to create additional residential parcels is only permitted if consistent with the policies of the Compatibility Plan.

4.3. General Plan Consistency with Compatibility Plan

4.3.1. Statutory Requirement: State law requires that each Local Agency having territory within an Airport Influence Area modify its general plan and any applicable specific plan to be consistent with the compatibility plan for the particular airport unless it takes the steps required to overrule the ALUC. In order for a general plan to be considered consistent with this Compatibility Plan, the following must be accomplished.

4.3.2. Elimination of Conflicts: No direct conflicts can exist between the two plans.

(a) Direct conflicts primarily involve general plan land use designations that do not meet the Density or Intensity criteria specified in Section 3.3 of this Compatibility Plan. In addition, conflicts with regard to other policies—height limitations in particular—may exist.

(b) A general plan cannot be found inconsistent with the Compatibility Plan because of land use designations that reflect Existing Land Uses even if those designations conflict with the compatibility criteria of this Compatibility Plan. General plan land use designations that merely echo the Existing Land Uses are exempt from requirements for general plan consistency with the Compatibility Plan.

(c) Proposed Redevelopment or other changes to Existing Land Uses are not exempt from compliance with this Compatibility Plan and are subject to ALUC review in accordance with Policies 1.5.1 and 1.5.2. To ensure that Nonconforming Uses do not become more nonconforming, general plans or implementing documents must include policies setting limitations on expansion and Reconstruction of Nonconforming Uses located within the Sacramento International Airport Influence Area consistent with Policies 4.1.3 and 4.1.4.

(d) To be consistent with the Compatibility Plan, a general plan and/or implementing ordinance also must include provisions ensuring long-term compliance with the compatibility criteria. For example, future reuse of a building must not result in a usage Intensity that exceeds the applicable standard or other limit approved by the ALUC.

---

37 See Chapter 1 and Appendix G for additional guidance.
38 This exemption derives from state law which proscribes ALUC authority over Existing Land Uses.
4.3.3. **Establishment of Review Process: Local Agencies** must define the process they will follow when reviewing proposed land use development within an *Airport Influence Area* to ensure that the development will be consistent with the policies set forth in this *Compatibility Plan.*

(a) The process established must ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the land use or zoning designation indicated in the *Local Agency’s* general plan, specific plan, zoning ordinance, and/or other development regulations that the *ALUC* has previously found consistent with this *Compatibility Plan* and that the development’s subsequent use or reuse will remain consistent with the policies herein over time. Additionally, consistency with other applicable compatibility criteria—e.g., usage Intensity, height limitations, *Avigation Easement* dedication—must be assessed.

(b) The review process may be described either within the general plan or specific plan(s) themselves or in implementing ordinances. Local jurisdictions have the following choices for satisfying this review process requirement:

1. Sufficient detail can be included in the general plan or specific plan(s) and/or referenced implementing ordinances and regulations to enable the local jurisdiction to assess whether a proposed development fully meets the compatibility criteria specified in the applicable compatibility plan (this means both that the compatibility criteria be identified and that *Project* review procedures be described);

2. The *Compatibility Plan* can be adopted by reference (in this case, the *Project* review procedure must be described in a separate policy document or memorandum of understanding presented to and approved by the *ALUC*); and/or

3. The general plan can indicate that all *Land Use Actions*, or a list of *Land Use Action* types agreed to by the *ALUC*, shall be submitted to the *ALUC* for review in accordance with the policies of Section 2.3.

4.4. **Criteria for Review of Airport Plans**

4.4.1. **Substance of Review:** In accordance with state law, any new or amended Sacramento International Airport master plan or development plan is subject to *ALUC* review for consistency with this *Compatibility Plan* (see Policy 1.5.5). In conducting any such review, the *ALUC* shall evaluate whether the airport plan would result in greater noise, safety, airspace protection, or overflight impacts than indicated in this *Compatibility Plan.* Attention should specifically focus on:

(a) Proposals for facilities or procedures not assumed herein, specifically:

1. Construction of a new runway or helicopter takeoff and landing area.
2. Change in the length, width, or landing threshold location of an existing runway.
3. Establishment of an instrument approach procedure that changes the approach capabilities at a particular runway end.
4. Modification of the flight tracks associated with existing visual or instrument operations procedures.

(b) New activity forecasts that are: (1) significantly higher than those used in developing Map 2, *Compatibility Policy Map: Noise*; or (2) assume a higher proportion of larger or noisier aircraft.

4.4.2. **Noise Impacts of Airport Expansion:** Any proposed expansion of airport facilities that would result in a significant increase in cumulative noise exposure (measured in terms of CNEL)
shall include measures to reduce the exposure to a less-than-significant level. For the purposes of this plan, a noise increase shall be considered significant if:

(a) In locations having an existing ambient noise level of CNEL 60 dB or less, the Project would increase the noise level by 3.0 dB or more.

(b) In locations having an existing ambient noise level of more than CNEL 60 dB, the Project would increase the noise level by 1.5 dB or more.

4.4.3. Consistency Determination: The ALUC shall determine whether the proposed airport plan or development plan is consistent with this Compatibility Plan. The ALUC shall base its determination of consistency on:

(a) Findings that the development and forecasts identified in the airport plan would not result in greater noise, safety, airspace protection, or overflight impacts on surrounding land uses than are assumed in this Compatibility Plan.

(b) Consideration of:

1. Mitigation measures incorporated into the plan or Project to reduce any increases in the noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight impacts to a less-than-significant level in accordance with provisions of CEQA; or

2. In instances where the impacts cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level, a statement of overriding considerations approved by the County of Sacramento as airport owner in accordance with provisions of CEQA.

(c) A determination that any nonaviation development proposed for locations within the Airport boundary (excluding federal- or state-owned property) will be consistent with the compatibility criteria and policies indicated in this Compatibility Plan with respect to the Airport (see Policy 1.2.11 for definition of aviation-related use).
Table 1

Noise Compatibility Criteria
Sacramento International Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL dB)</th>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 60</td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Land Areas: woods, brush lands, desert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water: flood plains, wetlands, lakes, reservoirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (except residences and livestock): crops, orchards, vineyards, pasture, range land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Uses: feed lots, stockyards, breeding, fish hatcheries, horse stables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Major Assembly Facilities (capacity ≥1,000 people): spectator-oriented outdoor stadiums, amphitheaters, fairgrounds, zoos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Recreation (limited spectator stands): athletic fields, water recreation facilities, picnic areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Non-Group Recreation: golf courses, tennis courts, shooting ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks: children-oriented neighborhood parks, playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping: campgrounds, recreational vehicle/motor home parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries (excluding chapels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential and Lodging Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential (&lt;8 d.u./acre): detached dwellings, townhouses, mobile homes, bed &amp; breakfast inns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential (≥8 d.u./acre): condominiums, apartments, agricultural-related housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Lodging (&gt;30 nights): extended-stay hotels, dormitories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Lodging (≤30 nights): hotels, motels, other transient lodging (except conference/assembly facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care: retirement homes, assisted living, intermediate care facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Institutional Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family day care homes (≤14 children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Schools: K-12, day care centers (&gt;14 children); school libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend (see last page of table for interpretation)

- Normally Compatible
- Conditional
- Incompatible

- Compatible at levels indicated, but noise disruption of natural quiet will occur
- Exercise caution with uses involving noise-sensitive animals
- Exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
- Exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
- Exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
- Exercise caution if clear audibility by users is essential
- Compatible at levels indicated, but noise disruption of outdoor activities will occur
- * Within CNEL 60-65 dB, new dwellings allowed on existing parcels (see Policy 1.4.3)
- New schools incompatible above CNEL 60 dB unless special circumstances exist (see Policies 3.2.2(a) and 4.1.5)
### Table 1, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL dB)</th>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 60</td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education classroom space: adult schools, colleges, universities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Major Assembly Facilities (capacity ≥1,000 people): auditoriums, conference centers, concert halls, indoor arenas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Large Assembly Facilities (capacity 300 to 999 people): movie theaters, places of worship, cemetery chapels, mortuaries</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation: gymnasiums, club houses, athletic clubs, dance studios</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Patient Medical: hospitals, mental hospitals, nursing homes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Patient Medical: health care centers, clinics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penal Institutions: prisons, reformatories</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Facilities: police, fire stations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Office, and Service Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Retail: regional shopping centers, 'big box' retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Retail: community/neighborhood shopping centers, grocery stores</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/Drinking Establishments: restaurants, fast-food dining, bars</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Retail/Wholesale: furniture, automobiles, heavy equipment, lumber yards, nurseries</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices: professional services, doctors, finance, civic; radio, television &amp; recording studios, office space associated with other listed uses</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Miscellaneous Services: barbers, car washes, print shops</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fueling: gas stations, trucking &amp; transportation terminals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, and Storage Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials Production: oil refineries, chemical plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial, High Intensity: food products preparation, electronic equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial, Low Intensity: machine shops, wood products, auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend (see last page of table for interpretation)**
- Normally Compatible
- Conditional
- Incompatible

- Interior CNEL limits in yellow cells apply in addition to other listed conditions (see Policy 3.2.3)
- Acoustical study may be required for noise-sensitive uses proposed in areas exposed to CNEL 60 dB or greater (see Policy 3.2.3(d))
## Table 1, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL dB)</th>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 60</td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Storage: wholesale sales, warehouses, mini/other indoor storage, barns, greenhouses</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Storage: public works yards, automobile dismantling</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; Extraction</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation, Communication, and Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Indoor Uses</th>
<th>Outdoor Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Terminals: airline, general aviation</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail &amp; Bus Stations</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Routes: road &amp; rail rights-of-way, bus stops</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking: surface lots, structures</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Facilities: emergency communications, broadcast &amp; cell towers</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Plants (primary, peaker, alternative energy)</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Substations</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Facilities: treatment, disposal</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Disposal Facilities: landfill, incineration</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Transfer Facilities, Recycle Centers</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend** (see last page of table for interpretation)

- Normally Compatible
- Conditional
- Incompatible

### Interpretation/Comments

**Normally Compatible**

*Indoor Uses*: Either the activities associated with the land use are inherently noisy or standard construction methods will sufficiently attenuate exterior noise to an acceptable indoor community noise equivalent level (CNEL); for land use types that are compatible because of inherent noise levels, sound attenuation must be provided for associated office, retail, and other noise-sensitive indoor spaces sufficient to reduce exterior noise to an interior maximum of CNEL 50 dB

*Outdoor Uses*: Except as noted in the table, activities associated with the land use may be carried out with minimal interference from aircraft noise

**Conditional**

*Indoor Uses*: Building structure must be capable of attenuating exterior noise to the indoor CNEL indicated by the number in the cell (either 45 or 50)

*Outdoor Uses*: Caution should be exercised with regard to noise-sensitive outdoor uses; these uses are likely to be disrupted by aircraft noise events; acceptability is dependent upon characteristics of the specific use

**Incompatible**

*Indoor Uses*: Unacceptable noise interference if windows are open; at exposures above CNEL 65 dB, extensive mitigation techniques required to make the indoor environment acceptable for performance of activities associated with the land use

*Outdoor Uses*: Severe noise interference makes the outdoor environment unacceptable for performance of activities associated with the land use
Notes

1. This caution is directed at the project proponent and is not intended to preclude approval of the project.
2. Noise-sensitive land uses are ones 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, the following: 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.

Table 1, continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Safety Zone</th>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Multiple land use categories and compatibility criteria may apply to a project</td>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Numbers below indicate zone in which condition applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Land uses not specifically listed shall be evaluated using criteria for similar uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>▶ See footnote regarding applicability of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limits-shown in yellow cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Numbers in brackets for some uses are Occupancy Load Factors 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Maximum Intensity and Lot Coverage Criteria apply to Normally Compatible as well as Conditional land uses (see Policies 3.3.3, 3.3.4, and 3.3.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Sitewide Average Intensity (people/acre)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Single-Acre Intensity (people/acre)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nonresidential development must meet both limits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage (bldg. footprint) applicable to all development</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legend</strong> (see last page of table for interpretation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally Compatible</td>
<td><img src="Diagram1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td><img src="Diagram3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram4.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatible</td>
<td><img src="Diagram5.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram6.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Uses (limited or no activities in buildings)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Land Areas: woods, brush lands, desert</td>
<td><img src="Diagram7.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram8.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water: flood plains, wetlands, lakes, reservoirs</td>
<td><img src="Diagram9.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram10.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (except residences and livestock): crops, orchards, vineyards, pasture, range land</td>
<td><img src="Diagram11.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram12.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Uses: feed lots, stockyards, breeding, fish hatcheries, horse stables</td>
<td><img src="Diagram13.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram14.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Major Assembly Facilities (capacity ≥1,000 people): spectator-oriented outdoor stadiaums, amphitheaters, fairgrounds, zoos</td>
<td><img src="Diagram15.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram16.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Recreation (limited spectator stands): athletic fields, water recreation facilities, picnic areas</td>
<td><img src="Diagram17.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram18.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Non-Group Recreation: golf courses, tennis courts, shooting ranges</td>
<td><img src="Diagram19.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram20.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks: children-oriented neighborhood parks, playgrounds</td>
<td><img src="Diagram21.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram22.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping: campgrounds, recreational vehicle/motor home parks</td>
<td><img src="Diagram23.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram24.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries (except chapels)</td>
<td><img src="Diagram25.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram26.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential and Lodging Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential (&lt;8 d.u./acre): individual dwellings, townhouses, mobile homes, bed &amp; breakfast inns</td>
<td><img src="Diagram27.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram28.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential (≥8 d.u./acre): condominiums, apartments, agricultural-related housing</td>
<td><img src="Diagram29.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram30.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Lodging (&gt;30 nights): extended-stay hotels, dormitories</td>
<td><img src="Diagram31.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Diagram32.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Safety Compatibility Criteria

Sacramento International Airport
### Table 2, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Safety Zone</th>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \times ) Multiple land use categories and compatibility criteria may apply to a project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers below indicate zone in which condition applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \times ) Land uses not specifically listed shall be evaluated using criteria for similar uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>See footnote regarding applicability of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limits shown in yellow cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \times ) Numbers in brackets for some uses are Occupancy Load Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Intensity and Lot Coverage Criteria apply to Normally Compatible as well as Conditional land uses (see Policies 3.3.3, 3.3.4, and 3.3.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Max. Sitewide Average Intensity (people/acre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Max. Single-Acre Intensity (people/acre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Numbers in brackets for some uses are Occupancy Load Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maximum Lot Coverage (bldg. footprint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend (see last page of table for interpretation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Normally Compatible</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Incompatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Lodging (( \leq 30 ) nights): hotels, motels, other transient lodging (except conference/assembly facilities) ([\text{approx. } 200 \text{ s.f./person}])</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care: retirement homes, assisted living, intermediate care facilities</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Institutional Uses</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family day care homes (( \leq 14 ) children)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Libraries ([\text{approx. } 100 \text{ s.f./person}])</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Major Assembly Facilities (capacity ( \geq 1,000 ) people): auditoriums, conference centers, concert halls, indoor arenas</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Large Assembly Facilities (capacity 300 to 999 people): movie theaters, places of worship, cemetery chapels, mortuaries ([\text{approx. } 15 \text{ s.f./person}])</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation: gymnasiums, club houses, athletic clubs, dance studios ([\text{approx. } 60 \text{ s.f./person}])</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Patient Medical: hospitals, mental hospitals, nursing homes</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Patient Medical: health care centers, clinics ([\text{approx. } 240 \text{ s.f./person}])</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penal Institutions: prisons, reformatory facilities</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(3 - 5: ) Allowed only if alternative site outside zone would not serve intended public function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Facilities: police, fire stations</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Office, and Service Uses</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Retail: regional shopping centers, &quot;big box&quot; retail ([\text{approx. } 110 \text{ s.f./person}])</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(3, 4: ) Ensure intensity criteria met; capacity (&lt; 1,000 ) people per bldg; evaluate eating/drinking areas separately if (&gt;10) of total floor area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Use Category

- Multiple land use categories and compatibility criteria may apply to a project
- Land uses not specifically listed shall be evaluated using criteria for similar uses
- Numbers in brackets for some uses are Occupancy Load Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers below indicate zone in which condition applies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| See footnote regarding applicability of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limits shown in yellow cells
| Maximum Intensity and Lot Coverage Criteria apply to Normally Compatible as well as Conditional land uses (see Policies 3.3.3, 3.3.4, and 3.3.10)

### Max. Sitewide Average Intensity (people/acre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. Single-Acre Intensity (people/acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all nonresidential development must meet both limits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maximum Lot Coverage (bldg. footprint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>applicable to all development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend (see last page of table for interpretation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normally Compatible</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Incompatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Local Retail: community/neighborhood shopping centers, grocery stores [approx. 170 s.f./person] | 0.39 | 0.62 | 3 - 4: 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] | 0.14 | 0.22 | 3 – 4: Ensure intensity criteria met |
| Limited Retail/Wholesale: furniture, automobiles, heavy equipment, lumber yards, nurseries [approx. 250 s.f./person] | 0.34 | 0.75 | 2, 5: Ensure intensity criteria met; design site to place parking inside and bldgs outside of zone if possible |
| Offices: professional services, doctors, finance, civic; radio, television & recording studios, office space associated with other listed uses [approx. 215 s.f./person] | 0.30 | 0.49 | 0.79 | 0.64 | 2 - 5: Ensure intensity criteria met |
| Personal & Miscellaneous Services: barbers, car washes, print shops [approx. 200 s.f./person] | 0.28 | 2, 5: Ensure intensity criteria met |
| Vehicle Fueling: gas stations, trucking & transportation terminals | 0.28 | |
| Hazardous Materials Production: oil refineries, chemical plants | 0.28 | |
| Heavy Industrial | 0.28 | |
| Light Industrial, High Intensity: food products preparation, electronic equipment [approx. 200 s.f./person] | 0.46 | 0.74 | 3 - 4: Ensure intensity criteria 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. 300 s.f./person] | 0.41 | 1.05 | 2, 5: Ensure intensity criteria 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 |

---
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## Table 2, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Safety Zone</th>
<th>Criteria for Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Sitewide Average Intensity (people/acre)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Single-Acre Intensity (people/acre)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all nonresidential development must meet both limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage (bldg. footprint)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend (see last page of table for interpretation)

- **Normally Compatible**
- **Conditional**
- **Incompatible**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Normally Compatible</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Incompatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>[approx. 300 s.f./person]</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Yellow Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Red Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Storage: wholesale sales, warehouses, mini/other indoor storage, barns, greenhouses [approx. 1,000 s.f./person]</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Yellow Cell" /></td>
<td>2: Ensure intensity criteria met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Storage: public works yards, automobile dismantling</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; Extraction</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation, Communication, and Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Normally Compatible</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Incompatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Terminals: airline, general aviation</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail &amp; Bus Stations</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Routes: road &amp; rail rights-of-way, bus stops</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking: surface lots, structures</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Facilities: emergency communications, broadcast &amp; cell towers</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Plants (primary, peaker, alternative energy)</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Substations</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Facilities: treatment, disposal</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Disposal Facilities: landfill, incineration</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Transfer Facilities, Recycle Centers</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green Cell" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Use Acceptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Acceptability</th>
<th>Interpretation/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normally Compatible</td>
<td>Normal examples of the use are compatible under the presumption that usage intensity and maximum lot coverage criteria will be met. Atypical examples may require review to ensure compliance with usage intensity and lot coverage criteria. Noise, airspace protection, and/or overflight limitations may apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Use is compatible if indicated Usage Intensity, Lot Coverage, and other listed conditions are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatible</td>
<td>Use should not be permitted under any normal circumstances. Limited exceptions possible for site-specific special conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1. Listed Occupancy Load Factors (square feet per person) are based on information from various sources and are intended to represent busy-period usage for typical examples of the land use category.
2. Floor Area Ratios (FARs) are based on listed Occupancy Load Factor for the land use category and are intended as guidance for meeting the Sitewide Average Intensity limits. See Policy 3.3.4(a).
3. No new structures intended to be regularly occupied are allowed.
4. Object Free Area (OFA): Dimensions are established by FAA airport design standards for the runway and are depicted on the Compatibility Policy Map: Safety in this chapter.
5. Construction of a single-family home, including a second dwelling unit as defined by state law, is allowed on a legal lot of record if such use is permitted by local land use regulations. A family day care home (serving ≤14 children) may be established in any existing or allowed dwelling. See Policy 3.3.2(f).
6. These land uses constitute uses of special concern for which safety restrictions apply irrespective of usage intensities. See Policy 3.3.7.
7. Power lines or other tall objects associated with these uses may constitute airspace obstructions. See Policy 3.4.2 for land use restrictions.

- These uses may attract birds, generate dust, produce smoke or steam plumes, create electronic interference, or otherwise pose hazards to flight. See Section 3.4 for land use restrictions.

---

Table 2, continued
Notes
1. See Section 1.5 for land use actions subject to ALUC review in each referral area.
CHAPTER 2
POLICIES


2. These noise contours are a composite of the projected contours associated with the north-only and split extension scenarios for Runway 16L-34R. See Policy 1.3.2.

3. See Section 3.2 and Table 2 for criteria applicable in each zone.

Notes

2. These noise contours are a composite of the projected contours associated with the north-only and split extension scenarios for Runway 16L-34R. See Policy 1.3.2.

3. See Section 3.2 and Table 2 for criteria applicable in each zone.
Notes
1. See Section 3.3 and Table 2 for criteria applicable in each zone.
2. Air carrier, general aviation, and military aircraft accident risks are all components of safety zones at Sacramento International Airport. Existing and future runway configuration scenarios are also components. Safety Zone policy map boundaries are a composite of all components.
Sacramento International Airport
Land Use Compatibility Plan
(Adopted December 12, 2013)

Map 4a

Compatibility Policy Map:
Airspace Protection - Existing Runway Configuration
1. See Policy 3.4.3 for criteria applicable within 10,000-foot FAA separation area for wildlife attractants.

2. See Policy 3.4.4 for criteria regarding other hazards to flight beneath Airspace Protection Surfaces.
Notes

1. See Section 3.5 for policies applicable in each zone.

2. Airport Proximity Disclosure applies within entire Airport Influence Area. See Policy 3.5.3

3. Includes locations within CNEL 60dB contour, Safety Zones 1 through 5, and Critical Airspace Zone. Avigation Easement Dedication required. See Policy 4.1.1

4. Includes locations where aircraft regularly fly below 2,000 feet. Avigation Easement Dedication required. See Policy 4.1.1

5. Includes locations where aircraft regularly fly below 3,000 feet. Recorded Overflight Notification required. See Policy 3.5.2