Meacham Field Joint Airport
Zoning Board

Created by the 1969 Airport
Zoning Act

Taken From Texas Local Government Code:
CHAPTER 241. MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY ZONING AUTHORITY AROUND AIRPORTS
COMPOSITION:

17 members, with two representatives each to be appointed by the Cities of:

Fort Worth, Blue Mound, Haslet, Lake Worth, River Oaks, Saginaw, and Sansom Park

Representatives appointed by the City Council by ordinance.

Two representatives to be appointed by the Commissioners Court of Tarrant County; and a Chairperson to be elected by a majority of the members so appointed.
Authority:

The joint airport zoning board has the same power to adopt, administer, and enforce airport hazard area zoning regulations or airport compatible land use zoning regulations under this section as that given a political subdivision by Sections 241.011 and 241.012.
Purpose:

(.... An airport in the interest of the public or in which an airport owned or operated by a defense agency of the federal government or the state is located may create a joint airport zoning board with another political subdivision .....The political subdivisions must act by resolution or ordinance in creating the joint board.)
Purpose (Cont):

Before an airport zoning regulation may be adopted, a political subdivision acting unilaterally under Section 241.013 must appoint an airport zoning commission.

A joint airport zoning board created under Section 241.014 is not required to appoint a commission...
What We Know

• Board meets “on call” at Meacham Field Terminal Building.
Land Planning Tools Analysis

(In General - All Jurisdictions)
Zoning & Subdivision Ordinances

- Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*, as they pertain to NAS, JRB Fort Worth, have not been incorporated into local ordinances.
- Do not authorize more restrictive airfield zoning districts within the 65 DBN.
- Do not address density and land use issues regarding APZ’s.
- Do not require disclosure of proximity to a military installation, airport or noise contour as part of site plan submittal.
- Do not address encroachment.
Comprehensive Plans

• Future land use plans do not address uses for undeveloped land within the 65 DBN or higher noise contours for compatibility with air operations.
• Goals and objectives do not address encroachment reduction or mitigation.
• Goals and objectives do not address AICUZ disclosure.
• Do not emphasize inter-local agreements with the military.
Development Codes

• In the 65-70 dB DNL Noise Zone, there are no restrictions on development (other than noise attenuation measures defined by IBC).

• No local governments in the region implement tools specifically designed to address military/civilian compatibility issues, such as sound attenuation of buildings in high noise areas.
Recommendations

(All Jurisdictions)
Creation of policies and ordinances that:

- Preserve long-term compatibility between the installation and community
- Promote comprehensive community planning
- Encourage cooperation between base officials and community officials
- Integrate the local jurisdictions’ general and comprehensive plans with the installation’s plans
- Help to implement noise exposure and accident potential reduction measures through building code and zoning/subdivision ordinance revisions.
- Reduce the operational impacts on adjacent communities
- Align planning criteria more closely with mission system criteria.
Examples

• Adopt encroachment prevention measures
• Adopt codes and ordinances to limit the height of objects around NAS JRB Ft. Worth
• Require note on plats for subdivisions within 65 DNL contours
• Policy of excluding public investment (CIP) in facilities or noise-sensitive uses established
• No new structure or use may be constructed or established or any existing use or structure substantially changed or altered or repaired within an APZ area unless a permit has been granted by Building Inspection Department.
Examples

• Adopt overlay district requirements
• Creation or amendment of developer agreements to include acknowledgement of noise zones
• Maps delineating noise zones available to the public
• Adopt regulations that would maintain residential densities within noise sensitive areas
• Adopt an airport environs ordinance
Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base
Land Use Analysis Summary
(As compiled by NCTCOG Staff, June 8, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Developed Acres within 65 DNL noise contours</th>
<th>Acres within 65 DNL noise contours which are Classified as Lake</th>
<th>Acres within 65 DNL noise contours which are Classified as Vacant</th>
<th>Total Acres Impacted by 65 DNL noise contours¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benbrook</td>
<td>381.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>144.80</td>
<td>526.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>6,069.13</td>
<td>3,816.37</td>
<td>1,834.75</td>
<td>11,720.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lake Worth</td>
<td>464.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>72.76</td>
<td>537.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Tarrant County</td>
<td>387.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>450.36</td>
<td>838.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westover Hills</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westworth Village</td>
<td>736.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>131.09</td>
<td>867.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Settlement</td>
<td>1,623.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>434.48</td>
<td>2,058.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,682.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,816.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,068.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,567.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All parcels within or partially touching the 65 DNL noise contour were included in this analysis and acreage is based on Tarrant County Appraisal District data (current as of January 1, 2005) which does not include roadways.
Analysis Assumptions

• Parcel data is taken from Tarrant Appraisal District (dated January 1, 2005)

• All parcels within or touching the 65 DNL line were included in the analysis

• NCTCOG staff used various data sources to identify a SLUCM for each parcel in the study area
Summary of SLUCM-Identified Parcels

- Total number of parcels in the 65 DNL = 12,792

- Total acreage of parcels that are all or in part within the 65 DNL = 16,567

- All Parcels have been assigned a SLUCM to assist in the analysis of compatibility with DOD land use recommendations
## Lake Worth Example Analysis

Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)  
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base  
Land Use Analysis Summary

### City of Lake Worth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Acres within 65 DNL noise contours</th>
<th>Acres within 65 DNL noise contours which are Classified as Lake</th>
<th>Acres within 65 DNL noise contours which are Classified as Vacant</th>
<th>Total Acres Impacted by 65 DNL noise contours&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>464.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>72.76</td>
<td>537.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> All parcels within or partially touching the 65 DNL noise contour were included in this analysis and acreage is based on Tarrant County Appraisal District data (current as of January 1, 2005) which does not include roadways.
### Lake Worth Example Analysis

**Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)**
**Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base**
**Land Use Analysis Summary**

**City of Lake Worth**

#### Safety Zone Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Type</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Lake Acreage</th>
<th>Vacant Acreage</th>
<th>Compatible Developed Acreage</th>
<th>Incompatible Developed Acreage</th>
<th>Number of Incompatible Single Family Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Zone</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Potential Zone 1</td>
<td>119.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>116.60</td>
<td>247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Potential Zone 2</td>
<td>259.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>204.80</td>
<td>529.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>378.70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Noise Zone Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Level (db DNL)</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Lake Acreage</th>
<th>Vacant Acreage</th>
<th>Compatible Developed Acreage</th>
<th>Incompatible Developed Acreage</th>
<th>Number of Incompatible Single Family Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-85</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-80</td>
<td>143.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>133.71</td>
<td>317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-75</td>
<td>282.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>242.70</td>
<td>464.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>93.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>35.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>537.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Lake Worth Example Analysis

Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base
Land Use Analysis Summary

City of Lake Worth

Standard Land Use Coding Manual (SLUCM) Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLUCM</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Noise Zones (dB DNL)</th>
<th>Safety Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85+</td>
<td>80-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>Single Family, detached</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>Single Family, semi-detached</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>Multi-Units, side-by-side</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>Multi-Units, one above the other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>Apartments, walk up</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>Apartments, elevator</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Group Quarters</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Transient Lodgings</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Aircraft Transportation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Automobile Parking</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Other Transportation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Contract Construction</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Governmental Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Cultural Activities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.5/81.7</td>
<td>Livestock Farming</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that density levels exceed compatibility limits.
## Compatibility Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>2005 Appraised Value</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>$154.7 Million</td>
<td>3,665.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible (with conditions)</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>$925.2 Million</td>
<td>6,769.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatible</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>$295.8 Million</td>
<td>3,963.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>$47.1 Million</td>
<td>3,068.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,816.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For More Information:

Fletcher Clark III
fclark@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9285

or

Michael Mallonee
mmallonee@nctcog.org
(817) 704-2513

www.nctcog.org/jlus
Encroachment Partnering
Update from the Conservation Forum

JLUS Policy Committee
June 18, 2007

Mike Sims, A.I.C.P.

North Central Texas Council of Governments
www.nctcog.org
Encroachment Partnering
Compatible Use Buffering Authorities

10 USC, Chapter 159, Section 2684a

Department of Defense may partner with conservation groups

Mechanism for funding the transfer outside of traditional contracting
Encroachment Pressures
A Two-Way Street

- Light Pollution
- Commercial Development
- Population Encroachment
- Maritime Needs
- Air Quality
- Noise Generation & Abatement
- Commercial Airspace
- Endangered Species and Provision of Wildlife Habitat
- Alternative Energy Sources
- Need for Water
- Radio Frequency Requirements
- Radio Frequency
- Cultural Interests on Military Lands
- Wilderness Designations
- Mission Realignment & Consolidation
- Dust & Smoke
- Military Airspace
- Munitions Constituents

Reduced Flexibility for the Military and the Community
Encroachment Pressures

Urban Encroachment Results in Habitat Loss

Urban Encroachment
Incompatible land use and conflicts over noise, dust, training activity

Habitat Loss
Army lands increasingly carry conservation responsibilities for surrounding areas

Result: Restrictions on type, timing, and location of training activities that can compromise military readiness
Encroachment Partnering Examples
February 2006 ACUB Status

Approved ACUB Proposals

Pending ACUB Proposals
February 2006
Encroachment Partnering

Texas Examples

• **Ft. Bliss, Texas** (Underway)
  - Partners
    - Ft. Bliss
    - Frontera Land Alliance
    - City of El Paso
  - Multiple encroachment issues
  - Potential Castner Range reuse

• **NAS Corpus Christi** (Underway)
  - Partners
    - NAS Corpus Christi
    - Navy Region South
    - Coastal Bend Land Trust
    - Conservation Fund
  - APZ 1, Security, and other concerns
  - Regional Parks and Conservation Planning Effort
Encroachment Partnering

Potential Partner Example #1

IF

Area with high concentration of single family in noncompliant noise/safety zones

AND

Single family in the zone has a high concentration of rental property, code violations, and tax delinquent property

AND

Area has good or potentially good frontage roadway access

AND

DOD has goal of decreasing incompatible buffer land uses

AND

Local governments have the goal of transitioning to employment-related land uses

THEN

Encroachment partnering project to voluntarily acquire parcels, assemble, and re-plat for a compatible employment related land use
Encroachment Partnering
Potential Partner Example #2

IF

Area with high concentration of single family in noncompliant noise/safety zones

AND

Single family in the zone has a high concentration of rental property, code violations, and tax delinquent property

AND

Area is adjacent or nearby to natural or park resources

AND

DOD has goal of decreasing incompatible buffer land uses

AND

Local governments and/or conservation partner have a goal of transitioning to park or natural resource areas

THEN

Encroachment partnering project to voluntarily acquire parcels, assemble, and re-plat for a compatible park or natural resource uses
Encroachment Partnering

For More Information:

Mike Sims, A.I.C.P.
msims@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9226

www.nctcog.org/jlus