

6. Appendices

A. GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

The Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Tustin Specific Plan/Reuse Plan is consistent with and supportive of the goals and policies of the City of Tustin and Irvine General Plans, as amended to reflect conversion from a military to a civilian use. A discussion of the relationship of this Specific Plan to each of the General Plan elements follows.

A. Land Use Element

The Tustin Land Use Element consists of thirteen goals which provide the framework for land use planning and decision-making within the City of Tustin. The major goals that directly relate to the Specific Plan are presented below:

- Provide for a well-balanced land use pattern that accommodates existing and future needs for housing, commercial and industrial land, open space and community facilities and services, which maintain a healthy, diversified economy adequate to provide future City services.
- Ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding land uses in the community, the City's circulation network, availability of public facilities, existing development constraints and the City's unique characteristics and resources.
- Improve urban design in Tustin to ensure development that is both architecturally and functionally compatible, and to create uniquely identifiable neighborhoods, commercial and business park districts.

- Promote expansion of the City's economic base and diversification of economic activity.

The Specific Plan accommodates a range of land uses that will provide a healthy balance of market driven, private sector uses along with a wide range of public serving uses. A variety of housing opportunities, employment, educational and community support uses will complement surrounding uses and strengthen the economic base of the area. The location and mix of uses within the Plan area are intended to minimize noise, traffic, air quality, and other potential environmental impacts.

The Plan includes the community facilities and infrastructure necessary to support the planned uses. Furthermore, the Plan provides critical links in certain facilities including the local and regional transportation system and trails.

Design guidelines and development standards within the Plan address the aesthetic integration of uses within the site and with surrounding uses. The focus is to integrate anticipated land uses with existing facilities, and provide for architectural, landscape, streetscape, and site design enhancements to improve the character of the site. Furthermore, the Plan is divided into Neighborhoods, which will have their own characteristics and set of functions to perform within the Plan.

Uses with the best revenue generation potential will be developed in the early phases of development. The Plan anticipates the future by promoting uses and institutions that will accommodate and attract 21st century jobs and technologies.

The Land Use Element of the City of Irvine General Plan consists of six land use planning goals. These goals are similar to those of the Tustin Land Use Element in that they seek to balance land uses, provide compatible land uses, and promote economic prosperity. Irvine's Urban Design Element seeks to provide a visually attractive, efficiently organized and identifiable city. The Public Facilities Element also looks to provide a full range of necessary public facilities and services. The Specific Plan is consistent with these Irvine General Plan Elements based on the above discussion of the Plan's provisions and intent.

B. Circulation Element

The Tustin Circulation Element is designed to provide a safe, efficient and adequate circulation system that will provide adequate capacity for future land uses in the City of Tustin. The following goals relate to the Specific Plan:

- Provide a system of streets that meets the needs of current and future inhabitants, and facilitates the safe and efficient movement of people and goods throughout the City consistent with the City's ability to finance and maintain such a system.
- Increase the use of non-motorized modes of transportation.
- Provide for well-designed and convenient parking facilities.

The Specific Plan supports two levels of roadway in terms of circulation system function. Roadways of regional significance will cross the Plan area to serve thru-traffic as well as project generated traffic. The local internal roadway system will connect and serve the land uses in the Plan area itself.

The Plan incorporates a non-residential land use/trip budget tracking system to manage the forecasted vehicular trips generated by the proposed land use mix. The purpose of the tracking system is to ensure that development can be accommodated within the planned roadway capacity of on-site and off-site roadway systems.

Pedestrian and bicycle uses are believed to serve as a significant mode of transportation. Bikeways and pedestrian paths will connect with existing local and regional facilities surrounding the area, as well as provide a comprehensive internal system.

The project shall provide sufficient off-street parking for any new buildings constructed and for any new use established; for any addition or enlargement of an existing building or use; and for any change in the occupancy of any building or a manner in which any use is conducted that would require additional parking spaces. Joint use of parking facilities may be authorized by the Planning Commission for uses with significantly different peak hours of operation.

The City of Irvine's Circulation Element establishes similar goals such as providing a balanced transportation system that will accommodate projected local and regional needs and providing pedestrian and bicycle systems that will encourage non-motorized modes of transportation. The Specific Plan is consistent with the Irvine Circulation Element based on the above discussion of the Plan's provisions and intent.

C. Conservation, Open Space, and Recreation Element

The Tustin Conservation, Open Space, and Recreation Element addresses issues and opportunities to conserve the City of Tustin's sensitive lands and to enhance the open space within the city. The following goals relate to the Specific Plan:

Appendices

- Reduce air pollution through proper land use, transportation and energy use planning.
- Protect water quality and conserve water supply.
- Encourage the development and maintenance of a balanced system of public and private parks, recreation facilities, and open space that serves the needs of existing and future residents in the City of Tustin.
- Maintain and enhance the City's unique culturally and historically significant building sites or features.

The Specific Plan contains a mixture of uses that will enable people to live and work on the site. This mixture of uses will allow occupants to meet a significant part of their daily needs within the site. The Plan will also concentrate on the proper placement of buildings, roads and services in order to provide convenient connections between uses, convenient access for motorists and pedestrians, and necessary buffering or screening of certain activities or uses.

The Recreational Bikeway/Trail Concept Plan will provide an opportunity to complete vital links necessary for a comprehensive regional system as well as improve the local system. The pedestrian and bike facilities are intended to serve as a significant means of transportation throughout the area.

Four existing Irvine Regional Water District (IRWD) abandoned wells are located along the western edge of the base. IRWD has an interest in abandoning and relocating these wells. The base's internal reclaimed water system ties into the Barranca Parkway pipeline at Jamboree Road and extends north towards Edinger Avenue. The line is military property. IRWD recommends the abandonment of the existing reclaimed water mains and providing service connections to developments from a new backbone system. IRWD has expressed interest in giving up ownership of existing well properties on the northwest side of the site at Red Hill Avenue in exchange for new well sites near the site's northern border.

Numerous public parks, private recreation facilities, and trails are called for in the Plan to serve the residents. Three neighborhood parks, a community park, and a regional park are included in the Plan. The neighborhood parks are intended to serve existing and planned residential areas while the community and regional parks are intended to serve the larger community. Additionally, an 18-hole golf course will provide private recreation facilities in the Golf Village. These parks and recreation facilities will be made pedestrian-friendly due to their close proximity to residential uses.

The northern blimp hangar, which is on the National Register of Historic Places, may be preserved as part of the Urban Regional Park if financially feasible. The hangar will set the theme for the park and will be a landmark of the Specific Plan area.

The City of Irvine's Conservation, Open Space and Recreation Element addresses the development and maintenance of a network of recreational areas as well as the maintenance of historical resources as part of the City's land use pattern. The Energy Element of the Irvine General Plan sets the goal of conserving energy by maximizing energy efficiency through land use and transportation planning. The Cultural Resources Element strives to ensure the proper disposition of historical and cultural. The Parks and Recreation Element calls for the provision of parks and recreational opportunities. The Specific Plan is consistent with these Irvine General Plan Elements based on the previous discussion of the Plan's purpose and intent.

D. Public Safety

The Tustin Public Safety Element is intended to identify natural and man-made hazards and establish policy to minimize the exposure of Tustin residents to these hazards. The following goal of the Tustin Public Safety Element relates to the Specific Plan:

- Reduce the risk to the community's inhabitants from exposure to hazardous materials and wastes.

MCAS Tustin has been a user of hazardous materials and there have been numerous documented spills and leaks on the site. The military has created a team to organize and implement the Base Closure and Realignment Act Clean Up Plan. All provisions of the Tustin and Irvine Hazardous Materials Codes and Fire Codes shall apply to any use, handling, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials.

The City of Irvine General Plan includes a Safety Element as that which identifies natural and man-made hazards. The Safety Element also seeks to identify actions that the City, in concert with other jurisdictions, must take to reduce the probability of a hazard occurrence. Also, Irvine's Waste Management Element calls for the efficient disposal of refuse and solid waste material without deteriorating the environment. These are similar to the above stated City of Tustin General Plan goals and are consistent with the Specific Plan.

E. Noise

The purpose of the Tustin Noise Element is to develop strategies to reduce excessive noise resulting from mobile sources such as traffic, aircraft, rail,

and stationary sources such as construction activity, music and air conditioners. The following goal of the Tustin Noise Element relates to the Specific Plan:

- Use noise control measures to reduce the impact from transportation noise sources.

Plans for noise attenuation of residential units located near arterial highways and railroad rights-of-way, which will ensure that interior and exterior noise levels do not exceed state requirements and local city noise ordinances, shall be submitted for review and approval prior to building permits being issued to accommodate reuse and/or subdivision approval for residential development, whichever occurs first.

The Noise Element of the City of Irvine General Plan also seeks to ensure that City residents are not exposed to high levels of mobile noise and hopes to achieve maximum efficiency in noise abatement efforts. The above discussion provides a basis for consistency with the Specific Plan.

F. Growth Management

The Tustin Growth Management Element intends to ensure that there is an adequate traffic circulation system to support the growth and development of the city. The goals of the Growth Management Element that apply to the Specific Plan are:

- Ensure adequate transportation facilities are provided for existing and future inhabitants of the City.
- Strive to develop and maintain a balance between jobs and housing in Tustin.

The Specific Plan provides for two levels of roadways in terms of circulation system function. The first in the hierarchy are roadways of regional significance which cut across the Plan area. These roads will serve thru-traffic as well as project generated traffic. The second type of roadway will be an internal roadway system that will connect and serve the land uses in the Plan area. Together these roadways are designed to serve the internal circulation and external accessibility needs of future land uses.

The Plan is expected to generate approximately 23,400 permanent jobs at buildout, which will improve the jobs/housing balance within the City. Furthermore, the mix of uses will enable people to live, work, shop, recreate, and attend community college classes within the Plan area.

The City of Irvine's Growth Management Element also strives to ensure that the City is able to provide an adequate circulation system. The

Specific Plan is consistent with the Irvine Growth Management Element based on the above discussion of this goal.

G. Housing

The purpose of the Tustin Housing Element is to identify the housing programs aimed at meeting the identified housing needs of the City's population. The City of Tustin has identified the following goals in the Housing Element, all of which have a relationship to the Specific Plan:

- Provide an adequate supply of housing to meet the City's need for a variety of housing types to meet the diverse socio-economic needs of all community residents.
- Ensure equal housing opportunities for all existing and future City residents regardless of race, religion, ethnicity, sex, age, marital status of household composition.
- Increase the percentage of ownership housing to ensure a reasonable balance of rental and owner-occupied housing within the City.
- Preserve the existing supply of affordable housing in the City.
- Conserve, maintain, rehabilitate and/or replace existing housing in neighborhoods which are safe, healthful and attractive, in accordance with adopted Land Use Policy. Improve the residential character of the City with an emphasis on revitalizing neighborhoods showing signs of deterioration. Promote conservation of the City's sound housing stock, rehabilitation of deteriorated units where they may exist City-wide, and elimination of dilapidated units which endanger the health, safety and well-being of occupants.
- Ensure that new housing is sensitive to the existing natural and built environment.

A variety of low density, medium density, and medium-high density residential uses are included in the Specific Plan/Reuse Plan to accommodate the diverse socio-economic needs within the community. The low and medium density developments are oriented toward ownership tenure while the medium-high density development is more closely oriented toward rental tenure. Apartment development is limited in most of the Planning Areas to a maximum of twenty-five percent (25%) to ensure a reasonable balance of rental and owner-occupied housing within the City. Housing accommodation for low- and very-low income families

Appendices

will be dispersed and integrated in all of the neighborhoods throughout the Specific Plan/Reuse Plan to ensure equitable housing opportunity.

In an effort to rehabilitate existing housing and neighborhoods within Tustin and Irvine, the Specific Plan area contains existing military housing developments that may be retained and converted for civilian use. Specific architectural enhancements, site improvements, and utility modifications are identified in the Plan which will be necessary to upgrade the units to market-rate standards.

The Specific Plan/Reuse Plan also recommends a "Homeless Accommodation Plan" which identifies the needs of the homeless within the communities of Tustin and Irvine, how those needs will be addressed, and makes recommendations on how the Navy should convey property and who might be authorized Homeless Service Providers. The Plan, as outlined, focuses on the concept of establishing a "continuum of care" as promulgated by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In developing the Plan, special consideration was given to recommendations regarding accommodating housing for the homeless, both emergency shelter and transitional housing, in existing barracks and housing areas. Such units located in existing single-family or attached housing areas should be required to be reasonably dispersed throughout a project and to be compatible in design with adjacent market rate units. The intent is to minimize the distinction between "homeless accommodation projects" and traditional ownership/ rental housing, thereby allowing for fuller integration into the neighborhoods.

In addition to the use of specific Homeless Service Providers to respond to specific homeless population needs, the Plan also focuses on developing private sector opportunities to contribute to the overall continuum of care by requiring the dedication of affordable housing units. Affordability categories are specifically outlined and will be more clearly established at the time of project approvals to ensure conformity with the City's most current Housing Element objectives.

The Housing Element of the City of Irvine General Plan establishes goals similar to those of the Tustin General Plan. These include: encouraging a variety of housing types for all economic segments and for special housing populations; ensuring open housing practices and accessibility to housing; and preserving and increasing affordable opportunities in the existing housing stock. The Specific Plan is consistent with these goals based on the above discussion of the Plan's provisions and intent.

B. PUBLIC BENEFIT CONVEYANCE REQUESTS

In considering all public conveyance requests, the Housing and State and Local Screening Sub-Committee considered and made recommendations to the Base Closure Task Force for a number of applications based upon their application's ability to meet one or more of the evaluation criteria approved by the Task Force and described within the application packet itself. In making its final determinations, the Base Closure Task Force either approved, approved as modified or denied these applications. Applications which were approved or approved as modified are described within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan, along with any required conditions of approval. Final Task Force reasons for denial or modification of a request for property conveyance are described below.

H. Homeless Provider Applications Denied

1. California Paralyzed Veterans - The California Paralyzed Veterans (CPV) requested 100 family units of permanent housing for homeless disabled veterans and non-veterans. Although no specific site for this request was identified, it was assumed by the LRA that the proposal was to locate the 100 units within the installation's existing family housing areas.

The Task Force denied the application for reasons which included:

- Not all required application information was submitted. More specifically, no organizational chart or detailed assessment of need was provided; no locations or properties for the program were identified; details of the proposed management plan were missing; state and federal grant funding levels were not clearly defined.
- CPV did not demonstrate an adequate enough financial status, adequate enough sources of funding nor an adequate ability to finance the proposal in that the proposed project relies upon receipt of future rents and does not clearly indicate a reliable alternate source of funding.
- The proposal did not fulfill a critical need gap identified in Tustin or Irvine's Consolidated Plans, nor would it serve specific local community needs in that no estimate of the homeless population to be served is indicated, no description of Tustin/Irvine needs and the application did not indicate whether similar programs already exist in the community.

- The proposal did not balance the economic and community development needs of the community in that if approved, the project would constitute an estimated \$150,000 annual impact upon the community through property tax and potential redevelopment tax increment losses. In addition, the proposal identified ongoing costs which were unrealistically expected to be borne by the City of Tustin. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.
 - CPV had no demonstrated experience in owning or operating similar programs or facilities, no clear link to other service providers and the proposal was inconsistent with Task Force policy direction to provide a continuum of care at the site (provision of housing only with no clear links to training, services, education, etc. at or near the base).
 - It was felt that the proposed program could be accomplished by other means other than property transfer in that other more qualified and experienced applicants had requested property for homeless purposes at MCAS Tustin. These and other existing homeless housing opportunities within the communities could accommodate the clientele served by CPV.
2. Jamboree Housing Corporation - Jamboree Housing Corporation submitted a proposal to provide transitional housing, affordable rental housing, market rate rental and for-sale housing for 600 family units within the installation's existing family housing areas (274 Dwelling Units Northwest Area, 326 Dwelling Units Southeast Area).

The Task Force denied the request for reasons which included:

- Not all required application information was provided. More specifically, no tax returns were submitted; a description of what expansion of services would be needed to accomplish the proposal; no breakdown of funding available to implement the request was provided; no authorization to acquire property was submitted.

- There is an adequate supply of "for rent" properties particularly in Tustin at rents which meet low income requirements. Therefore, the request for housing in Tustin was felt to not fulfill a critical need gap in Tustin's Consolidated Plan as the proposal did not deal with Tustin needs. Also, both Irvine and Tustin General Plans have policies discouraging any concentration of homeless housing. With this in mind, the unit count proposed was viewed as an over concentration of affordable units.
- The program concept and approach was inconsistent with Task Force policy direction which favored ownership of existing housing and desire to want to see a major portion of housing to return to the tax roll to offset the significant infrastructure needs of the Reuse Plan.
- There was no clear link to other service providers which was inconsistent with Task Force policy direction to provide a continuum of care (provision of housing only with no clear links to training, services, education, etc. at or near the base). The applicant only indicated a desire to identify and utilize County-wide programs to support the proposed program. As such, no clear link to on-base or community based Continuum of Care programs was offered by the applicant.
- The applicant provided no clear description within their proposal that demonstrated experience in transitional housing or experience with much smaller programs. Also, the proposal suggested the use of a subcontractor (Solari Enterprises) but presented no information on their abilities or experience.
- They did not balance the proposal against economic and other community development needs of the community in that the project would constitute an estimated \$450,000 annual impact to the community due to lost property tax and potential redevelopment tax increment revenues. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.

Appendices

- The program can be accomplished by other means rather than property transfer. It was felt that the provision of affordable units could be accommodated in the Reuse Plan without the need to take these units off the tax roll including public/private partnerships, negotiated sale with deed restrictions guaranteeing a certain number of units being retained as affordable, the use of an economic development conveyance by the LRA, etc.
3. Orange County Housing Corporation - The Orange County Housing Corporation submitted a proposal requesting 30 family units to be located somewhere within the installation's existing family housing areas for use as "Bridge" housing for families.

The Task Force denied the request for reasons which included:

- Not all required application information was submitted. More specifically, a detailed narrative description of the proposed use was not provided; there were no specific sites identified; there were no specifics regarding experience with ownership provided; there was no clear explanation of the proposed program benefit, target clientele to be served, how the program was to accomplish the goal of eliminating hopelessness, etc.; and, there was no explanation of how a contracted administrator would accommodate conveyance of additional facilities.
- The applicant did not demonstrate an adequate enough financial stability, adequate enough sources of funding and presented a limited ability to finance the proposal in that no surplus funds exist according to submitted audits for the two previous years, and no new revenue sources were identified in the information provided.
- The request for rental housing units was found to not fulfill a critical need gap in Tustin's Consolidated Plan. There is adequate supply of "for rent" properties particularly in Tustin at rents which meet low-income requirements.
- The proposal did not serve specific community needs as participation in the proposed housing opportunity was described to be from throughout Orange County.

- There was no clear link to other service providers which is inconsistent with Task Force policy direction to provide a continuum of care (proposed provision of housing only with no clear links to training, services, education, etc. at or near the base).
 - The program concept and approach for acquiring these units for rental housing would not meet community and Task Force expectations that future affordable owner-occupied housing return to the tax roll.
 - The program can be accomplished by other means rather than property transfer and taking units off the tax roll, including private/public partnerships, negotiated sale with deed restrictions guaranteeing a certain number of units being retained as affordable, the use of an Economic Development Conveyance by the LRA, etc.
4. SBC Community Homeless Coalition - SBC submitted an application which proposed that 22 family units within the installation's existing Northeast housing area be used for transitional housing for families.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- Not all required application information was submitted. More specifically, no listing of principal officers in the organization was provided; there was no organizational chart or administrative procedures provided; there was no assessment of local homeless need to be met by the program provided; there was no discussion of how the proposal is consistent with reuse plan, and there was no explanation or justification of the need for facilities identified for conveyance, etc.
- The applicant did not demonstrate an adequate enough financial status, adequate enough sources of funding nor ability to finance the proposal in that the proposal relied upon grants, rental income and donations, none of which could be guaranteed with any certainty.
- The applicant did not demonstrate adequate experience in providing and/or operating similar programs in their proposal in that they had only incorporated recently (August 11, 1995).

Appendices

- The proposal had no clear link to other service providers which resulted in its being considered inconsistent with Task Force policy direction to provide a continuum of care (proposed provision of housing only with no clear links to training, services, education, etc. at or near the base).
 - No upgrade of existing units was proposed which would create a negative impact on the surrounding community.
5. Veterans Charities of Orange County - The Veterans Charities of Orange County submitted an application which proposed that 192 barracks units be used to accommodate transitional housing for single men and women.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- Not all required application information was submitted. More specifically, the applicant did not submit all of the required financial information; no tax returns were provided; no marketing strategy was provided; and, no schedule for completion and financing of all improvements was provided.
- The applicant did not demonstrate an adequate enough financial status, adequate enough sources of funding nor ability to finance the proposal in that the submitted project proforma shows that a positive cash flow for the project would not happen until the 12th year of the project. According to their submitted financial statement, the charity has ended 1994 and 1995 with a positive cash flow of only \$15,953 and \$34,937 respectively. No funding source was identified to fund the \$370,680 rehabilitation costs associated with the proposal, although it was assumed that the charity would attempt to secure a loan for this purpose.
- The strength of any link to other service providers was vague in the proposal. More specifically, the program promotes the provision of homeless vocational training and educational services internally and does not provide links to other planned or existing continuum of care opportunities within the community or at MCAS Tustin.
- It represented a competing request with another agency better able to provide the service proposed.

6. Society of St. Vincent de Paul - The Society of St. Vincent de Paul submitted an application which proposed that a Food Distribution Center be located within an existing 66,000 sq. ft. warehouse building at the installation.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- The proposal (food distribution) did not fill a critical need gap identified in Tustin or Irvine's Consolidated Plan, nor would the proposal serve existing or planned homeless food distribution needs that weren't currently being filled by the existing food distribution center located in the City of Orange. In addition, the proposed program was intended to replace this existing service.
- The program is a duplication of available support services at another location (similar facilities are leased by the applicant within the City of Orange).
- It did not balance the economic and other needs of the community as it appeared that there would have been a negative impact on the property's ability to generate needed tax revenue resulting in the annual loss to the community of approximately \$52,400 in redevelopment tax increment and \$16,500 annually in interim lease payments for use of an existing building at the site. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.

7. Orange County Development Council - The Orange County Development Council submitted an application which proposed that a Food Bank be located within an existing helicopter hangar on the installation near Warner Avenue and Red Hill Avenue.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- The proposal (food distribution) did not fill a critical need gap identified in Tustin or Irvine's Consolidated Plan, nor would the proposal serve existing or planned homeless food distribution needs that weren't currently being filled by the existing food distribution center located in the City of Garden Grove. In addition, the

proposed program was intended to replace this existing service.

- The program is a duplication of available support services at another location (similar facilities are leased by the applicant within the City of Garden Grove).
- It did not balance the economic and other needs of the community as it appeared that there would have been a negative impact on the property's ability to generate needed tax revenue resulting in the annual loss to the community of approximately \$52,400 in redevelopment tax increment and \$16,500 annually in interim lease payments for use of an existing building at the site. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.

I. Homeless Provider Applications Modified

1. Human Options (DOVE Housing) - Dove Housing originally proposed to provide 20 emergency transitional housing opportunities for homeless families distributed within various portions of the installation's existing family housing (10 dwelling units in the base's Northeast (N/E) Housing Area, 10 dwelling units in the base's Southeast (S/E) Housing Area). However, due to the type of multi-family unit (apartment-style) configuration currently existing within the neighborhood, the Task Force approved Dove's use of six units to be accommodated in one 6-plex. Dove Housing is experienced in owning and operating similar facilities, especially emergency shelter programs elsewhere in the County. The proposal to serve homeless families would fill a homeless need "gap" in the continuum of care approach identified by the community. The proposed program would promote coordination with support service providers, school districts, etc., and encourages linkages with job training, employment and education opportunities provided within the proposed reuse plan and community at large. The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.
2. Families Forward (formerly Irvine Temporary Housing) - Families Forward originally requested 13 transitional housing

opportunities for homeless families in the installation's Southeast family housing area. However, due to the type of multi-family unit (apartment-style) configuration currently existing within the neighborhood the Task Force approved their use of 14 units to be located in one 6-plex, and two 4-plexes due to existing unit configuration within that area. Units are to be dispersed in the Southeast Housing Area at MCAS Tustin (City of Irvine). Irvine housing currently owns and operates several similar facilities in the City of Irvine. The organization is fiscally and organizationally sound and has shown that they are capable of operating these additional facilities at this time. Although not currently anticipated to be linked to service opportunities proposed for MCAS Tustin, Families Forward's program does provide educational, housing and vocational training opportunities to clients to ensure that the cycle of hopelessness can be permanently ended and participants provided the tools to once again become contributing members of the community. Also, the proposal would fill a need "gap" identified by the City of Irvine's Consolidated Plan, assisting that community in their continuum of care approach. The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.

3. Orange Coast Interfaith Shelter - Orange Coast Interfaith Shelter (OCIS) originally proposed to provide six family units of transitional housing located within the installation's Southeast Housing Area which could be located in one 6-plex. However, the Task Force approved the use of all six units within the Northeast Housing Area due to the Task Force's desire to avoid the possibility of over-concentration of homeless accommodation within the S/E housing area. All units would be two bedroom units. OCIS owns and operates similar facilities in the region and was found to be organizationally and fiscally proven to be sound, competent and capable of operating the proposal. The provision of transitional housing to homeless families would fill an identified need gap in the community's continuum of care approach as identified within its HUD approved Consolidated Plan. Also, the program envisions linkages with education, job training, employment and other services intended to break the cycle of hopelessness and poverty. The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.
4. Salvation Army - The Salvation Army proposed to operate an emergency/transitional housing shelter consisting of 24 or 26

existing family housing units in the Northeast and Southeast Housing Areas currently existing at MCAS Tustin. In addition, the Salvation Army requested transfer of one 96 unit barracks structure.

The Task Force denied the request for transfer of the 96 unit barracks structure because the request included only one of the two buildings located on the site chosen by the Task Force for this purpose; the proposal would have posed possible problems as two operators would be forced to share facilities, parking, and property; two programs at the site might be incompatible; and, another qualified applicant had submitted a proposal which would utilize both structures in a concerted fashion to provide identical homeless services thus avoiding the possibility of conflict with another organization.

The Task Force approved the use of 24 family housing units within the Northeast Housing area only to avoid the possibility of over-concentration of homeless accommodation within the Southeast area. It is estimated that their proposal alone would accommodate approximately 50% of the unsheltered homeless identified in the Tustin and Irvine Communities. The Salvation Army operates other similar programs in the County. The proposal would provide emergency/transitional housing to homeless families filling an identified need "gap" in the continuum of care approach. The Salvation Army is proven to be organizationally and financially capable of providing the service proposed. The Task Force approved this portion of the request as modified above with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.

J. State and Local Agency Applications Denied

1. California Department of Education - The California Department of Education submitted an application which proposed that a Food Distribution Center be located within an existing 66,000 sq. ft. warehouse building at the installation:

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- The proposal (food distribution) did not fill a critical need gap identified in Tustin or Irvine's Consolidated Plan, nor would the proposal serve existing or planned homeless food distribution needs that weren't currently being filled by the existing food distribution center

located in Los Angeles County. In addition, the proposed program was intended to replace this existing service.

- The program is a duplication of available support services currently provided from another location (similar facilities are leased by the applicant within the County of Los Angeles).
- It did not balance the economic and other needs of the community as it appeared that there would have been a negative impact on the property's ability to generate needed tax revenue resulting in the annual loss to the community of approximately \$52,400 in tax increment and \$16,500 annually in interim lease payments for use of an existing building at the site. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.

2. California Baptist College - The California Baptist College submitted an application which proposed that a small evening college facility be provided for use in educating service personnel and families who may be displaced by the closure of MCAS Tustin or MCAS El Toro. While a specific location was not identified by the applicant, the LRA believed that the most appropriate location for such a service was the Learning Village identified within the community's approved Land Use Plan.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- There are existing federal programs to provide the proposed service to displaced military personnel and their families.
- Approval of the request would have introduced numerous property owner interests in the Learning Village which might create problems administering the property, access, parking, property maintenance, etc., which could eventually negatively impact the community.
- Due to the size of the proposal (only a 1,300 square foot space was requested), the request could be fulfilled through means other than a property transfer. Therefore, it was suggested that the applicant work with South

Appendices

Orange County Community College District in the Learning Village if the proposed program were found to be beneficial to the needs of the proposed Learning Village.

3. Chapman University - Chapman University also submitted an application which proposed that a small building be provided for use in offering night courses to members of the community. While the specific location was not identified by the applicant, the LRA believed that the most appropriate location for such a service was the Learning Village identified within the community's approved Land Use Plan.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- Due to the size of the proposal (only a 10,000-15,000 square foot space was requested), the request could be fulfilled through means other than a property transfer. Therefore, it was suggested that the applicant work with South Orange County Community College District in the Learning Village if the proposed program were found to be beneficial to the needs of the proposed Learning Village.
 - Approval of the request would have introduced numerous property owner interests in the Learning Village which might create problems administering the property, access, parking, property maintenance, etc., which could eventually negatively impact the community.
4. Rancho Santiago Community College District - Rancho Santiago Community College District (Rancho) was the originator of the "Learning Village" concept and was instrumental in its being included in the approved Land Use Plan. Their application requested transfer of 116 Acres for this purpose. However, the Learning Village is located within the South Orange County Community College District. As such, Rancho has no legal authority to own property located within another community college district. Consequently, the Task Force directed Rancho to work with South Orange County Community College District through a JPA or MOU for joint use of the Learning Village.
 5. Santa Ana Unified School District - Santa Ana Unified School District (Santa Ana Unified) submitted an application requesting the transfer of 75 acres of base property for use as a

high school. Santa Ana Unified's district boundaries include only the small southwesterly corner of the base. The approved Land Use Plan identified a variety of commercial, light industrial and recreational uses within that district. No residential uses would be allowed within Santa Ana Unified's district boundaries. Consequently, no student generation impacts to the district would directly result from the future development of the base as limited by the Reuse/Specific Plan for MCAS Tustin.

The Task Force denied the request for reasons which include:

- The proposal was inconsistent with Task Force policy direction on the preferred Reuse Plan and it was inconsistent with the proposed Reuse Plan in that the site location requested had previously been identified for reuse in support of commercial, commercial recreational, business and light industrial uses (which is reflective of uses currently existing in locations surrounding the proposed site).
- The site requested by the SAUSD is one of the most valuable land areas at MCAS, Tustin with important reuse and job creation potential which would be affected by the proposed transfer of 75 acres. The base is already overburdened by numerous public benefit requests. The City of Tustin currently has integrated into its Reuse Plan a significant number of other anticipated public benefit conveyances. Given the incredibly high infrastructure costs required for the base to be reused, any additional public property transfers may seriously harm the community's ability to fund these improvements.
- The proposal does not balance the economic and other needs of the community as it appeared that there would have been a negative impact on the property's ability to generate needed tax revenue resulting in the annual loss to the community of approximately \$1,223,000 in tax increment and \$11,500 annually in interim lease payments for use of an existing building at the site. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.

Appendices

- There are no residential uses proposed by the City's Reuse Plan within the SAUSD District boundary at MCAS, Tustin. Therefore, no students would be directly generated which would create an impact on SAUSD facilities. In fact, the closest residential area to the proposed site at MCAS, Tustin is approximately one and one-half to two miles away. The Tustin Unified School District (TUSD) and Irvine Unified School District (IUSD) requests for conveyance were supported by the Tustin Base Closure Task Force because proposed residential uses are within both District boundaries at MCAS, Tustin. Since the residential uses will impact TUSD and IUSD facilities, those conveyances are appropriate.
 - SAUSD will have under California law the ability to adopt a School Facilities' Fee program within their district boundaries at the base of approximately \$.28 a square foot for all new construction. With over a million square feet of commercial and industrial space possible for development within the SAUSD boundaries based on the proposed Reuse Plan, SAUSD would see school facility revenue in excess of \$280,000 from proposed development on the base in addition to actual property tax revenue. Additionally, California law also provides that SAUSD could acquire property within the City of Santa Ana to meet their needs, serving the immediate residential neighborhoods of Santa Ana.
 - The requested 75-acre site is not the most suitable site for a school given its adjacency to two major arterial highways, its location within City of Tustin General Plan roadway Noise Impact Areas that will exceed 65 dba's, and the immediate interface with proposed industrial uses. In addition, the subject site will be impacted physically by the proposed widening of Red Hill Avenue which will require at least 20 feet of additional right-of-way dedication along Red Hill Avenue (the westerly portion of the requested SAUSD site) and extension of Warner Avenue which will require at least 100-120 feet of right-of-way dedication (the northerly portion of the requested 75-acre site).
6. Native American Indian Cultural Center - The Native American Indian Cultural Center submitted an application requesting transfer of approximately 130 acres of base property for use in

creating a four-year university program for Native-American students.

The LRA responded to the application informing the Native American Indian Cultural Center that the application did not meet the requirements set forth within the application packet for submittal of a Notice of Interest in MCAS Tustin property. A representative of the Cultural Center later informed LRA staff that they would not pursue acquisition of base property but would attempt to work with South Orange Community College District within the approved Learning Village concept (discussed above). However, the Task Force did consider their early request and denied it for reasons which include:

- The application was incomplete. The applicant was informed of this in writing and later informed staff of their intent to not pursue property at the installation. No resubmittal or additional materials were ever received from the organization demonstrating a desire to pursue this initial interest.
- The request did not demonstrate adequate financial status and ability to finance the proposal in that the programs proposed were to be funded with federal grant funds which had not yet been secured, nor were they committed by the federal government to the purpose proposed; there was no demonstrated experience in providing/operating similar programs/facilities identified within the application.
- Also, the proposed program was duplicating services proposed by South Orange Community College District.

7. City of Irvine - The City of Irvine submitted an application requesting approximately 5.8 acres immediately to the west and adjacent to the existing Jamboree Blvd. right-of-way. The request was to support the future development of a rapid transit corridor which was purported to be a critical regional link for Orange County Transit Authority (OCTA) rapid transit and commuter alternatives being explored for the region.

The Task Force denied the request for reasons which include:

- Anticipated costs for the proposed rail system is \$31 million dollars a mile with no identified funding source for this cost. There is a \$125 million dollar match

Appendices

required of the City of Irvine for which there is currently no funding source.

- A large portion of the right-of-way requested is within the City of Tustin and is inconsistent with the preferred Reuse Plan and incompatible with surrounding planned uses including: Residential Golf Village (including support commercial), commercial/industrial and retail/commercial. There is no City of Irvine owned right-of-way at either end of the request to enable its future use for the proposed purpose.
 - Mr. Dave Elbaum at OCTA has indicated to Tustin that the OCTA has no regional right-of-way needs at or near MCAS Tustin. No OCTA services are proposed to be provided at the proposed location now or in the future.
 - The proposal is inconsistent with the City of Irvine's current General Plan, Circulation Element, and Master Plan of Arterial Highways diagram which shows the proposed transit line along Harvard Avenue in the City of Irvine. Irvine has reserved Harvard for this purpose.
 - It did not balance the economic and other needs of the community as it appeared that there would have been a negative impact on the property's ability to generate needed tax revenue resulting in the annual loss to the community of approximately \$187,825 in tax increment and eliminates approximately 63,336 of buildable commercial square feet and up to 49 residential dwelling units in the proposed Golf Village. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.
8. Irvine Ranch Water District - The Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD) submitted an application requesting the conveyance of 4 replacement well sites and 1 existing well site comprising approximately 3 acres of land at the installation. Currently, the IRWD owns 4 existing well sites along Red Hill Avenue. Through discussions between the LRA and the IRWD, a commitment was made to accommodate IRWD needs in a manner which would be compatible with future development of the Reuse/Specific Plan at the sites requested. Formal transfer

to the IRWD prior to the receipt of development plans was perceived as problematic by the LRA since future development should incorporate the proposed well sites into their site design to ensure screening, access, etc.

The Task Force denied the proposal for reasons which include:

- The proposal was potentially inconsistent with the preferred Reuse Plan and incompatible with surrounding planned uses,
- It would be better for design, screening, site location, etc. to be integrated at the time of site development through a right-of-way dedication process.
- It did not balance the economic and other needs of the community as it appeared that there would have been a negative impact on the property's ability to generate needed tax revenue. With the Fiscal Impacts in the early years of the Reuse Plan expected to be significant to the local community, transfers of significant portions of the base off the tax roll would create even more severe impacts and impede reuse efforts.

K. State and Local Agency Applications Modified

1. Tustin Unified School District - Tustin Unified School District (TUSD) originally requested two 10 acre elementary schools, a 20 acre middle school site and a 50 acre high school. After LRA discussions with TUSD, TUSD reduced and modified their request to include only the two 10 acre elementary school sites and a 40 acre high school site to serve the larger Tustin community needs. Some residential development is proposed within the proposed Reuse Plan which would directly impact the TUSD.

The Task Force approved TUSD's request. However, the LRA had identified concerns regarding timing and financing of the proposed school uses and did not believe the burden for school construction to serve larger community needs should be borne by the MCAS, Tustin project. Consequently, it was the direction of the Task Force that an EDC transfer of the property occur to the LRA with subsequent LRA transfer to TUSD once adequate funds have been programmed for design and construction of each facility by TUSD. As an alternate to an EDC transfer, the LRA could also pursue an educational

conveyance. The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.

2. City of Irvine - The City of Irvine proposed to acquire approximately eight acres of vacant land located within the installation's Southeast Housing Area for use as a community park as well as necessary roadway access to the park on Marble Mountain. The requested park would help serve identified community recreation needs of nearby housing areas within and adjacent to MCAS Tustin. Included in the application for public conveyance, Irvine also requested transfer of a 72-foot wide Marble Mountain right-of-way needed to secure public use of the existing right-of-way accessing the existing housing area, the proposed community park and K-8 elementary school proposed by the Irvine Unified School District (noted above). The LRA recommended that the land transfer for public access to the park (Marble Mountain Road) be limited to the existing 60-foot wide right-of-way and the eight acre park. It was felt that any additional right-of-way could be obtained upon development of site design, with possible dedications taken at that time to accommodate the necessary right-of-way requirements. The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.
3. County of Orange Animal Control and Shelter - The County of Orange Animal Shelter (County) submitted a request for 4 acres of base property for use in assisting the relocation of the County's existing Animal Shelter currently located at the Orangewood site in the City of Orange. The proposal was to locate the site within an area of the base which had been planned for commercial and industrial uses. The LRA originally recommended that the proposal be denied as inconsistent with the Reuse Plan and cited that there were other more compatible sites in the area.

At the request of the County, the Task Force permitted the application to be modified so that the proposed Animal Control Shelter could be integrated within the County's proposed Urban Regional Park site (discussed below). This suggestion was viewed by the Task Force as a more compatible site location. Consequently, the proposal was approved as modified with specific conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.

4. County of Orange Environmental Management Agency - The County of Orange Environmental Management Agency

(County) submitted an application for an 88 acre Urban Regional Park. The boundaries of the proposed regional park would include preservation of the northerly historic blimp hangar for reuse in support of a range of recreational activities and events, if feasible. The County proposed to operate support ancillary commercial concession activities in the hangar to offset maintenance costs. In addition, the park is in close proximity to the City of Tustin's proposed 25 acre community park and is situated to support the recreational needs of an adjacent TUSD high school, the Community College proposal within the Learning Village, and existing and planned residential development on and off MCAS, Tustin. The City of Tustin City Council has formally adopted a resolution (Res. No. 94-20) supporting the County's submission of an Urban Park proposal to the federal Department of Interior. The proposal would provide a valuable recreation and open space opportunity, potentially preserve a National Register recognized historic blimp hangar, and would be consistent with the proposed Reuse Plan.

The Task Force approved a transfer of a modified request of 84.5 acres of property for this purpose due to the need to accommodate the TUSD's proposal for an adjacent high school. The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan.

5. County of Orange Flood Control District - The County of Orange Flood Control District requested approximately 7.15 acres of base land for use in supporting or expanding existing flood control and trail facilities. First, the Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD) submitted a proposal to acquire three existing flood control easements located on MCAS Tustin Property as follows:

- an approximate 50 foot wide existing flood control easement for Barranca Channel
- an approximate 50 foot wide existing flood control easement for the Santa Ana/Santa Fe Channel
- an approximate 170-180 existing flood control easement for Peters Canyon Channel

The County also requested an approximate 20 foot wide strip for future improvements to Barranca Channel, a 25 foot wide strip for the Santa Ana-Santa Fe Channel and an approximate 40 foot wide strip for the Peters Canyon Channel.

Appendices

The Task Force supported transfer of all existing easements for all channels and the additional 40 foot right-of-way for the Peters Canyon Channel for widening and to support multi-use of the channel for a major regional recreational trail. The additional right-of-way 20 and 25 feet right for the Barranca and Santa Ana/Santa Fe channel were not approved because they were not based on quantifiable design information. Rather than approving this portion of the conveyance request, the LRA is intending to include in the Plan the requirement that an offer to dedicate be required for the Barranca and Santa Ana/Santa Fe Channel for flood control purposes in the event said right-of-way is needed. This will ensure that negative economic impacts on the Plan are minimized.

The Task Force approved the request as modified with conditions identified within the MCAS Tustin Reuse Plan. Additional right-of-way for Santa Ana Channel and Barranca will be required as dedication in Reuse Plan.

C. PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
1	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	1943	11,210	FAIR	DEMO	YES	CHILDREN'S SHELTER
2	STATION SUPPORT	1943	12,660	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
3	AUDITORIUM	1943	5,700	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
4	STATION HEADQUARTERS	1943	13,253	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
5	ADMINISTRATION	1943	22,466	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
11	SEWAGE PUMP STATION (ABAND)	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FACILITY
12	SUBSTATION #1	1942	1,500	FAIR	DEMO	NO	LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FACILITY
13	COMBINED FIRE/RESCUE	1942	3,325	FAIR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
16	ADMINISTRATION	1942	7,900	FAIR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
17	MAINTENANCE SHOP	1942	6,077	FAIR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
19	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES LAB	1942	2,208	FAIR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
20A	WAREHOUSE	1943	13,536	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
20B	WAREHOUSE	1943	13,121	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
21	WAREHOUSE	1942	543	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
23A	BUNKER	1942	1,370	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
23B	BUNKER	1942	1,370	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
23C	BUNKER	1942	1,370	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
23D	BUNKER	1942	1,270	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
23E	BUNKER	1942	206	POOR	DEMO	NO	NEIGHBORHOOD PARK
23F	BUNKER	1942	2,520	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
26	CHAPEL	1945	3,803	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
27	STAND-BY GENERATOR	1942	3,242	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
28	HANGAR	1942	308,228	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
28A	STORAGE	1942	941	POOR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
29	HANGAR	1943	298,188	FAIR	TBD	YES	COMMUNITY CORE
29A	STORAGE	1942	941	POOR	TBD	YES	COMMUNITY CORE
30	GEMD/TSSA	1942	4,666	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
35	STAFF NCO CLUB	1943	6,802	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
35A	STORAGE	1943	1,311	FAIR	DEMO	YES	REGIONAL PARK
39	WIND DIRECTION INDICATOR	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
40A	STORAGE	1942	233	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
40B	STORAGE	1942	233	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
41	STORAGE	1942	2,712	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
42	ADMINISTRATION	1944	11,238	FAIR	DEMO	NO	CHILDREN'S SHELTER
47	ADMINISTRATION	1942	5,381	FAIR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
47T	SHOP WAREHOUSE/SHED	1990		POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
49	FIREHOUSE ANNEX	1942	1,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FACILITY
53	MOTOR TRANSPORT FACILITY	1942	1,970	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
66	PUBLIC WORKS SHOP	1944	3,663	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
71A	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71B	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK

Appendices

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
71C	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71D	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71E	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71F	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71G	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71H	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71I	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
71J	WAREHOUSE	1945	1,650	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
77	FLAGPOLE	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
86	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1953	14,531	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
87	PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	1953	14,388	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
88	RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	1953	14,388	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
89	WAREHOUSE	1953	7,575	FAIR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
90	WAREHOUSE	1953	10,600	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
92	ADMINISTRATION	1942	420	FAIR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
93	BACHELOR OFFICERS QUARTERS	1953	15,172	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
98	PAINT BOOTH (DECOMMISSIONED)	1954	552	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
103	TRAINING/CLASSROOM	1958	2,856	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
106	SELF SERVICE CAR WASH (DECOM)	1954	924	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
128	SOFTBALL DIAMOND #1	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
131	FOOTBALL FIELD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
132	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1961	30,636	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
134	ADMINISTRATION	1961	30,636	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
142	PICNIC SHELTER	1960	3,072	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
143	BARBECUE PIT	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
144	VOLLEYBALL COURT	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
145	BASKETBALL COURT	-	-	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
146	BARBECUE HUT	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
148	SOCCER FIELD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
149	VEHICLE GREASE RACK	1963	517	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
150	RACQUETBALL COURT	1963	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
159	BOWLING CENTER	1963	5,640	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
160	BASKETBALL/VOLLEYBALL COURT	-	-	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
161	APPLIED INSTRUCTION	1964	13,980	FAIR	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
162	PUBLIC TOILET	1965	245	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
163	PUBLIC TOILET	1965	245	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
164	SWIMMING POOL	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
165	CONVENIENCE FOOD STORE	1965	7,520	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
166	RETAIL STORE	1966	9,600	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
167	CAFETERIA	1966	1,800	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
168	SERVICE OUTLETS	1966	3,200	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
169	AIRCRAFT READY FUEL STORAGE	1966	203,644	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
170	AIRCRAFT READY FUEL STORAGE	1966	203,756	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
171	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS FACILITY	1965	8,048	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
172	BULK FUEL	1966	2,520	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
173	APPLIED INSTRUCTION	1966	26,000	FAIR	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
174	WELDING SHOP	1967	1,240	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
175	PARTS STORAGE	1967	384	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
176	EAF/EOD ADMINISTRATION	1967	9,760	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL
177	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1968	23,052	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
178	LINE MAINTENANCE SHACK	1967	1,400	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
179	LINE MAINTENANCE SHACK	1967	1,050	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
180	LINE MAINTENANCE SHACK	1967	1,050	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
181	LINE MAINTENANCE SHACK	1967	1,400	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
182	LINE MAINTENANCE SHACK	1967	1,050	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
183	COMBINED FIRE/RESCUE STATION	1968	6,827	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
184	ENLISTED MESS HALL	1969	22,007	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
185	AUTOMOTIVE HOBBY SHOP	1969	5,808	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
186	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	1970	10,765	FAIR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
187	PAINT & BLASTING SHOP (DECOM)	1970	1,200	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
189	FLOWER SHOP	1969	1,080	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
190	HANGAR	1970	42,818	GOOD	TBD	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
191	ACFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
192	ACFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
193	ACFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
194	DAY TANK ACFT FUEL STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
195	ACFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
196	ACFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
197	ACFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
198	DAY TANK ACFT FUEL STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
199	CHILD CARE CENTER	1970	5,853	FAIR	REUSE	YES	CHILD CARE CENTERS
201	STORAGE	1971	960	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
202	TENNIS COURTS	1971	-	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
203	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
204	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMUNITY CORE

Appendices

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
205	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
207	LINE MAINTENANCE SHACK	1971	1,920	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
208	SOFTBALL FIELD #2	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
209	OUTDOOR HELICOPTER MONUMENT	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
210	FUEL PUMP STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
212	ELEC/COMM MAINTENANCE SHOP	1972	3,700	FAIR	TBD	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
213	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1973	35,424	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
216	INDOOR HANDBALL COURTS	1974	1,722	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
218	ENLISTED CLUB	1976	10,384	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
219	EQUIPMENT STORAGE	1976	384	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
220	ENGINE TEST CELL ADMINISTRATION	1981	675	GOOD	TBD	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
221	PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	1977	4,200	FAIR	TBD	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
222	AUTO SERVICE CENTER	1974	4,680	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
225	MAIN GATE HOUSE	1980	24	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
226	FLIGHT SIMULATOR	1980	9,620	GOOD	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
227	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1981	48,960	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
228	ISSUE WAREHOUSE	1980	3,150	FAIR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
229	ACFT WASHRACK	1960	755	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
230	ACFT WASHRACK	1968	1,642	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
231	ENGINE TEST CELL PAD	1968	4,022	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
233	VEHICLE WASHRACK	1968	960	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
234	VEHICLE WASHRACK	1968	800	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
236	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
237	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	TBD	YES	COMMERCIAL
238	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	TBD	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
239	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
240	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	TBD	YES	LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING FACILITY
241	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
242	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	TBD	YES	REGIONAL PARK
244	FLIGHT LINE SHACK	1981	1,000	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
245	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1984	47,370	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
246	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1984	47,370	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
247	POL TESTING LAB ADMINISTRATION	1982	600	GOOD	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
248	HAZ WASTE TRANSFER FACILITY	1982	1,118	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
249	HEATING PLANT BLDG	1984	768	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
250	WAREHOUSE	1984	66,976	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
251	GROUND SUPPORT EQUIP SHOP	1984	13,770	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
252	GROUND SUPPORT EQUIP SHED	1984	10,755	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
253	APPLIED INSTRUCTION	1984	3,972	GOOD	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
254	REFUELER ADMINISTRATION	1984	700	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
255	REFUELER ADMINISTRATION	1984	700	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
256	FLAGPOLE	1983	0	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
257	RECREATION PICNIC SHELTER	1983	748	GOOD	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
258	NAVY RELIEF PAPER COLLECTION	1982	117	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
259	STORAGE	1984	1,025	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
260	LINE MAINTENANCE SHELTER	1984	1,000	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
261	LINE MAINTENANCE SHELTER	1984	1,000	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
262	HAZARDOUS/FLAM LOCKER	1984	300	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
263	HAZARDOUS/FLAM LOCKER	1984	300	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
264	HAZARDOUS/FLAM LOCKER	1984	300	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
265	HAZARDOUS/FLAM LOCKER	1984	300	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
266	HAZARDOUS/FLAM LOCKER	1984	300	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
267	HAZARDOUS/FLAM LOCKER	1984	150	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
268	FILLING STATION	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
269	GSE LOADING RAMP	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
273	ENGINE TEST CELL	1987	2,974	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
278	BASKETBALL COURT #1	-	-	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
279	VOLLEYBALL COURT #1	-	-	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
300	MAG-16 HEADQUARTERS	1943	21,170	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
303	GENERAL STORAGE SHED		1,610	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
306	HAZARDOUS/FLAM STORAGE	1949	100	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
502	BASEBALL FIELD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
503	SOCCER/PARADE FIELD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
504	BASEBALL FIELD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
505	TELEPHONE SWITCHING CENTER		240	POOR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
506	GENERATOR/TRANSFORMER BLDG	1985	360	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
507	VEHICLE WASHRACK BLDG	1985	228	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE

Appendices

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
508	AIRCRAFT WASHRACK BLDG	1985	684	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
509	AIRCRAFT WASHRACK BLDG	1985	684	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
511	STORAGE SHED	1986	1,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
512	STORAGE SHED	1986	1,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
513	STORAGE SHED	1986	1,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
514	STORAGE SHED	1986	1,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
514T	CONTRACTOR TRAILER				RELOCATE/DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
515	STORAGE SHED	1986	1,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
516	POLICE STATION	1986	1,551	GOOD	DEMO	NO	TRANSITIONAL/EMERG HSG
517	AIRCRAFT WASHRACK	1985	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
520	HANGAR	1989	63,289	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
523	APPLIED INSTRUCTION	1987	23,330	GOOD	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
524	HANGAR	1987	45,959	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
525	HANGAR	1987	45,959	GOOD	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL RECREATION
526	UTILITY BUILDING SHED	1987	1,672	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
527	FLIGHT LINE SHELTER	1987	2,000	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
528	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	1988	4,935	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
529	SUPPLY BUILDING	1988	15,000	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
530	COMMUNICATIONS/ MAINT BLDG	1988	5,029	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
531	WEATHER ANNEX	1988	800	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
532	GENERATOR BUILDING	1988	192	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
533	ARMORY	1988	5,363	GOOD	REUSE	YES	REGIONAL PARK
534	CRASH CREW BURN PIT	1988	-	GOOD	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
535	AIRCRAFT WASHRACK	1988	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL RECREATION
536	WASHRACK UTILITY BUILDING	1988	672	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL RECREATION
537	ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP	1988	35,717	GOOD	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
538	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1989	53,240	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
539	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1989	53,240	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
540	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE TANK	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
541	PUMP STATION #1	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
542	PUMP STATION #2	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
543	ACFT RINSE FACILITY	1988	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
544	RESTROOM FACILITY	1989	2,005	GOOD	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
545	SENTRY BOOTH	1989	91	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
546	ELECTRICAL/STORAGE ROOM	1989	1,755	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
547	CHILD CARE CENTER	1990	13,120	GOOD	REUSE	YES	CHILD CARE CENTERS
549	MECHANICAL ROOM	1989	933	GOOD	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
550	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
551	WASHRACK BUILDING	1989	1,000	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
552	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
553	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1991	40,332	GOOD	REUSE	YES	TRANSITIONAL/EMER HSG
554	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	1991	40,332	GOOD	REUSE	YES	TRANSITIONAL/EMER HSG
555	MECHANICAL BUILDING	1990	-	GOOD	REUSE	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
556	HAZARDOUS/FLAM STORAGE	1990	3,840	GOOD	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
557	MECHANICAL BUILDING	1991	1,400	GOOD	REUSE	YES	TRANSITIONAL/EMER HSG
558	FUEL ISLAND	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
559	LOADING RAMP	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
560	VEHICLE WASHRACK	1990	1,089	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
561	MECHANICAL BUILDING	1989	933	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
562	WAREHOUSE	-	2,363	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
563	SEWER METER VAULT	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
564	HAZARDOUS/FLAM STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
565	TACTICAL VAN PAD COMPLEX	-	-	GOOD	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
566	LUBE RACK	1988	1,760	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
567	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE PAD	1990	2,400	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
568	IMA COMPLEX	1991	19,680	GOOD	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
569	FPN-63 PAR SITE	1991	700	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
570	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
571	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
572	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
573	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
574	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
575	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
576	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK

Appendices

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
577	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
578	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
579	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
580	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	REGIONAL PARK
581	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
582	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
583	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
584	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
585	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
586	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
587	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
588	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
589	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
590	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
591	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
592	GENERATOR PAD	1991	180	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
593	SEWER LIFT STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
594	PICNIC SHELTER	1991	312	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
595	SEWER LIFT STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
596	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	200	POOR	DEMO	NO	GOLF VILLAGE
597	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	100	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
598	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	200	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
599	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	100	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
600	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	400	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
601	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	100	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL
602	HAZARDOUS/FLAM MAT'L LOCKER	1992	100	POOR	DEMO	NO	LEARNING VILLAGE
603	TRANSFORMER PAD	-	-	FAIR	REUSE	YES	LEARNING VILLAGE
604	AN/GMQ-13 TRANSMITTER	-	-	POOR	DEMO	YES	COMMUNITY CORE
605	AN/GMQ-13 RECEIVER	-	-	POOR	DEMO	YES	GOLF VILLAGE

PRELIMINARY BUILDING CONDITION SURVEY							
Bldg. No.	Existing Use	Year Built	Total Area (SF)	Condition	Proposed Disposition	Possible Interim Use	Ultimate Use
606	AN/FPN-63 MTI-REFLECTOR	-	-	POOR	DEMO	YES	GOLF VILLAGE
607	AN/UMQ-29	-	-	POOR	DEMO	YES	COMMUNITY CORE
608	AN/GMQ-10 TRANSMITTER	-	-	POOR	DEMO	YES	COMMUNITY CORE
609	AN/GMQ-10 RECEIVER	-	-	POOR	DEMO	YES	COMMUNITY CORE
610	GENERATOR WASHRACK	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
611	HAZARDOUS MATERIAL STORAGE	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
3000T	FREST ADMIN/CLASSROOM	?	10,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY CORE
3002T	GUARD SHACK	-	-	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
3003T	GUARD SHACK	1992	25	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
3005T	EQUIPMENT SHED	1990	225	POOR	DEMO	NO	RESIDENTIAL
6168	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	GOLF VILLAGE
6169	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	COMMERCIAL
6480	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	RESIDENTIAL
6798	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	RESIDENTIAL
6857	SEWAGE PUMP STATION	-	-	FAIR	DEMO	YES	RESIDENTIAL
A	OFFICERS QUARTERS	1946	2,800	POOR	DEMO	NO	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
B	OFFICERS QUARTERS	1946	2,200	POOR	DEMO	NO	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
C	VIP QUARTERS	1946	972	FAIR	DEMO	NO	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
C3	YOUTH CENTER	1943	6,552	POOR	DEMO	NO	COMMUNITY PARK
C4	OFFICERS CLUB	1943	7,548	FAIR	REUSE	YES	COMMUNITY PARK
LIST OF ACRONYMS							
ABAND	ABANDONED			HAZ	HAZARDOUS		
ACFT	AIRCRAFT			IMA	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY		
ADMIN	ADMINISTRATION			LAB	LABORATORY		
BLDG	BUILDING			MAG	MARINE AIR GROUP		
COMM	COMMUNICATIONS			MAT'L	MATERIAL		
COT	CITY OF TUSTIN			MWR	MORALE WELFARE, & RECREATION		
DECOM	DECOMMISSIONED			NCO	NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER		
DOE	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			OC	ORANGE COUNTY		
ELEC	ELECTRONICS			TBD	TO BE DETERMINED		
EQUIP	EQUIPMENT			FAC	FACILITY		
FLAM	FLAMMABLE			GSE	GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		

D. DEFINITIONS

Words, phrases and terms not specifically defined herein shall be as defined in the Tustin City Code.

Acres, Gross. An estimated allocation of land area within a Planning Area, measured from the edge of the adjacent arterial roadways and/or the boundary of the Planning Area (as shown on the Land Use Planning Areas map).

Acres, Net. An estimated allocation of land area within a Planning Area, based on gross acreage reduced for internal circulation (local roads) within a Planning Area.

Baseline Mix of Uses. An assumed mix of non-residential uses for each neighborhood, which establish a baseline capacity of average daily trips for each neighborhood.

Building Setbacks. Building setback distances are measured from future rights-of-way. Non-conforming building setbacks will be permitted to remain to accommodate existing buildings not in future rights-of-way.

Children's Intermediate Care Shelter. A 60-bed emergency shelter for abused, neglected children.

Concept Plan. A type of plan required concurrent with submission of a new development proposal, reuse project, or subdivision used to document and insure that the necessary linkages are provided between the development project and the Planning Area/Neighborhood in which it is located, the integrity of the Specific Plan and purpose and intent of each Neighborhood is maintained, and applicable considerations of City requirements are identified and satisfied.

Development Unit. Consists of all building sites, their private open space, common recreation and open space areas, and public and/or private streets serving the project.

Dwelling Units, Existing. The existing military family housing units within the MCAS Tustin boundary.

Dwelling Units per Acre. The maximum density per net acre at which dwelling units may be calculated. This overall density may not be exceeded even by a fraction.

Dwelling Units, Potential. The maximum number of new dwelling units, based on the density per net acre for the Planning Area.

Dwelling Units, Total. The maximum number of existing and potential dwelling units allocated to each Planning Area (where applicable).

Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.). The gross floor area of all buildings within a Planning Area divided by the net acreage of the Planning Area.

Existing Floor Area. The square footage of existing buildings within the MCAS Tustin boundary.

Floor Area, Potential. The potential square footage of new development within each Planning Area, assuming the square footage devoted to existing structure remains.

Floor Area, Total. The total square footage of non-residential development derived by multiplying the floor area ratio by the net acreage.

Household Income Level, Low. Fifty to eighty percent of the County median income level.

Household Income Level, Moderate. Eighty to one-hundred twenty percent of the County median income level.

Household Income Level, Very Low. Zero to fifty percent of the County median income level.

Interim Use. The purpose for which a parcel of land or a structure is or may be intended, designed, arranged, constructed, erected, occupied, leased, maintained, altered, moved and/or enlarged for a limited period of time in excess of six months and not to exceed 5 years from the date of the interim lease, in lieu of a permanent use in accordance with this Specific Plan.

Landscape Setbacks. Landscape setback distances are measured from the back of the curb and are a combination of parkway, sidewalk, and planting areas. Non-conforming landscape setbacks will be permitted to remain to accommodate existing walls not in future right-of-way.

Law Enforcement Training Facility. An educational facility including classroom training, office space, obstacle course, gym, locker and shower facilities, canine training, indoor pistol range, laser village and weapons storage to be located within the proposed Urban Regional Park site.

Mixed Use, Horizontal. Two or more primary uses in a single development project in which uses are arranged in separate structures throughout the development site.

Appendices

Mixed Use, Vertical. Two or more primary uses contained within a single structure in which uses occupy different floors of the structure.

Planning Area (PA). The smallest regulatory unit for the application of development regulations.

Reuse. The conversion of buildings and/or facilities from a military use to a civilian use upon closure of the base. All reuses shall be in conformance with the Tustin City Code.

Single Room Occupancy Hotel. A single room residential unit, typically 250 to 500 square feet, with a sink and closet, which may require the occupant to share a communal bathroom, shower, and/or kitchen.

Tenure. The ownership status of residential property (i.e., rental or owner-occupied).

Transitional/Emergency Housing Land Use Designation. Reuse of two existing barracks and accompanying parking areas for immediate and short-term housing and supplemental services that will assist the homeless in the transition to self-sufficiency.