MINUTES

Aviation Advisory Committee, West Plainfield Advisory Committee on Airport Development

Lillard Hall, Yolo County Airport, 24905 County Road 95 Thursday, August 21, 2003

Members in Attendance: Ken Price, Stuart Buchan, Chris Foe, Jim Belenis, Peter Defty

Members Absent:

Doug Kinkle, Roy Kanoff, John Hancock, Debbie Parrella

Others in Attendance: Supervisor Lynnel Pollock, Members of the community

County Staff:

David Daly, Airport Manager

Call to Order

The meeting commenced at 7:05 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

1. The Agenda was approved by the members present as submitted.

Approval of Minutes

2. The Minutes of June 19, 2003 were approved by the members present.

Items

3. Award by Department of Water Resources of funds to reconstruct and replace the existing Airport Water Well

Staff apprised members of the status of the new water well project and the anticipated construction completion schedule.

4. Reinstatement of Caltrans Grant Funds and Caltrans Matching Funds for FAA Grant Projects

Staff updated members of the committee as to the recent reinstatement by the State of California of portion Caltrans annual grant funds and financial assistance. Staff noted that Caltrans matching funds for FAA grant projects remained uncertain at this time.

5. Proposed Yolo County hanger development including 20 General Aviation Nested T-Hangers located south of the existing Yolo County hangers.

Staff presented the hanger proposal to the committee. Staff requested that the committee make a recommendation on the proposal; however, that staff would return to the committee prior to bringing the final project to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors for action. Staff stated that a positive committee recommendation would allow staff to move forward with Caltrans and on other requirements. The committee discussed the proposal and expressed general support; however, a question was raised regarding the level of public involvement with such committee discussions, and on airport projects, for the purpose of minimizing persons becoming involved at the end of the process after substantial time and energy were spent by the committee and staff.

A general question was raised regarding what the appropriate level of public notification should be for airport development proposals that are to be discussed by the committee. There was some disagreement among members as to what type of project might warrant broad public notification using an area such as the area established for the Airport's Aviation Overlay Zoning (two mile radius). It was noted that Aviation zoning was established for the protection of the airspace around the airport for the airport's function and operation as provided for by Federal Aviation Regulations; however, that the Aviation zoning was not established for the purpose of determining the distribution area for public hearing notices of committee agendas. The possible basis for determining the area of notification was further discussed including what level of notification was appropriate and necessary. The committee generally agreed that the breadth of public notification should be proportionate and depend on the type of proposed use, the character and size of a proposal, and the substance of a given proposal.

Staff noted that the present hanger project was a Principal Use on the airport and was to develop general aviation hangers for privately owned single-engine aircraft. Staff stated that the required public hearing notification involved: providing direct mailing notification to all property owners to within 300 feet of the project (airport) boundary; and, to have a public notice published in the Daily Democrat. Staff stated that additionally, notices are also mailed by Yolo County to all persons listed on the airports established committee agenda mailing list and notices are posted at other Yolo County facilities.

The use of a past notification lists was also raised. Staff noted that the older list of 225+ persons was updated last year through a solicitation process. Staff stated that the purpose of the solicitation was to determine what persons were interested in continuing to receive public notices on airport matters and committee agendas. Staff noted that based on the responses received that the public mailing list was updated and now contains approximately 60+ interested persons.

6. Other Airport Matters

No other matters were discussed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m. to the next bi-monthly meeting of Thursday, October 16, 2003.







