

Minutes
Joint Meeting -- Aviation Advisory/Airport Development Advisory Committees
September 8, 1999

Time convened: 7:16 p.m. ...

Committee Members:

<u>AAC</u>		<u>ADAC</u>		<u>Board Liaison</u>	
Kanoff	yes	Buchan	yes	Pollock	no
Hancock	no	McLin	no		
Merwin	yes	Wood	yes	<u>County Staff</u>	
Kinkle	yes	Parrella	yes	Ott (airport manager)	yes
Morris	yes			Drack	yes
Price	yes				
Dowling	yes				

The agenda was approved by both committees.

The floor was opened for public comment to items not included on the agenda. There was no comment.

The minutes of July 13, 1999 were corrected and approved by both committees (and are attached hereto).

The status of the airport (financial, maintenance, and operational) was addressed by the airport manager (Ott). A question was raised as to the status of Yolo Sportsmen berm improvements recommended by POST. Ott reported that one was completed and one was possibly completed by this time (later confirmed that it was complete as well).

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (the Airport Land Use Commission for the Yolo County Airport), will consider the updated Yolo County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) at their October 2nd meeting (10:00 am). Copies of the final draft plan had been mailed to committee members and made available to community members at the July 13th meeting. A CLUP update is required periodically and especially when a new Airport Specific Plan has been adopted by a Board of Supervisors.

The last agenda item was the policy for aviation easements in the vicinity of the Yolo County airport. A revised set of options and recommendation to the Board by the airport manager had been forwarded to the two advisory committees for review prior to this meeting. After significant discussion to ensure full understanding by everyone, both committees agreed (ADAC 3-0 with one absentee and AAC 6-0 with one absentee) to the option presented that evening to retain easements in the airport clear zones, to release all other easements either recorded or promised, and to create a zoning overlay to the County's Zoning Regulations for properties within the airport's 10,000 ft (measured from the runway centerline) airspace overflight zone. The purpose of the zoning overlay would be to provide information concerning the airport (shown in the attachment to these minutes).

Since the ADAC and AAC had, at the July 13, 1999 meeting, voted earlier for a different option, the committees requested that these minutes show both sets of options presented. The two different sets of options are attached. The airport manager is to forward the final report to be made to the Board at their September 21st meeting. The date this information will be forwarded is after the agenda review for the September 21st meeting. That review is Sept 15th.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. to meet again on September 29, 1999 prior to the Planning Commission meeting to consider revisions to the County Zoning Regulations which would contain the revisions directed by the Board of Supervisors relative to the zoning overlay.

September 8, 1999

Aviation Easement Policy Options

The following options were reviewed by the Advisory Committees:

Option	Pros	Cons
1. hold all existing easements in the current form now held	form of most of these easements outside the clear zone is seen by many airports to reinforce state and federal law in protecting airports from encroachment	nearby residents do not believe that easements for property outside clear zones in fact provide any greater degree of protection
Rationale: Selecting this option may provide the most direct method of recording protection rights of airports and communicating to prospective property buyers of such rights		
2. hold easements in clear zones, releasing others, and providing notice to owners of property within 10,000 ft of the runway centerline	basic safeguards exist in state and federal law and regulations; the existence of the airport pre-dates most residences and California real estate law requires sellers of properties to disclose any nuisances to prospective buyers	may not provide a permanent form of notification that airport users have legitimate right of flight over, and access to, the airport and that the defined level of noise (65 dB CNEL) is established by state regulation and not exceeded
Rationale: Selecting this option appears to address community concerns for fairness and consistency in the establishment of minimum effective airport protection measures.		
3. hold easements in clear zones, while releasing others ... create an aviation zoning overlay to the airport overflight zone (a 10,000 ft ellipse measured from the centerline of the runway)	in addition to easements in clear zones, an aviation zoning overlay should provide sufficient information to prospective buyers of property in the vicinity of the airport that airport protection measures exist in state and federal statutes	the definition of a zoning overlay will be needed to allay fears that this measure is an easement in another name
Rationale: Selecting this option may provide a greater degree of protection by listing the significant federal, state, and county laws, regulations, and codes which protect the airport and nearby residents alike and to which property owners seeking permits will be positively aware of those regulations		
4. offer revised (noise) easements to property owners not in clear zones	removes some easement language most offensive to the community	may be seen by some to remove the language most protective for the airport
Rationale: Selecting this option may provide an even greater degree of protection while meeting few of the expectations of the community in the vicinity of the airport.		

The options above were discussed at the September 8, 1999 joint meeting of the committees and are a variation of options presented at the January 20 and July 13 meetings.

Avigation Easements Options

JULY 13, 1999

The County of Yolo holds six easements (five avigation and one conservation) near the Yolo County Airport. Four of these easements (and two additional easements obtained but not yet effective) have come under question by the nearby property owners as to fairness and usefulness.

The goals of a small committee appointed by the joint advisory committees were to make a recommendation which provided fair resolution of this issue:

√ to the airport

√ to airport users

√ to nearby property owners

The below four options are for review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; see the attached sheet for a definition of the "clear zone":

Option	Pro's	Con's
1. hold all existing easements in the current form now held	form of most of the easements outside the <i>clear zone</i> seen by many jurisdictions to provide the most protection to airport from complaints	residents do not believe that the easements now held for property outside the <i>clear zones</i> in fact do provide the airport any significant degree of protection
Rationale: The avigation easement is the most direct method of recording restrictions on property so that title searches can be assured of informing potential property buyers of the existence and meaning of airport impacts; current easements are near the traffic pattern and/or airport property.		
2. hold easements in <i>clear zones</i> , release others and make public notice to property owners within 10,000 ft of the centerline of the runway.	seems fair to all if language of notice alerts all property owners of the public law which protects airports and nearby residents	may not provide a lasting degree of notification that airport users have legitimate right of flight near & access to the airport and that the defined level of noise (65 dB) is a reasonable attribute of airports
Rationale: The airspace area is now so large that reliance on public law and regulations and California real estate disclosure seem the only reasonable and effective method of protecting from the impacts of encroachment.		
3. obtain additional easements near the runway but not in the entire area known as the <i>airport airspace</i>	continue current practice which is seen by many to provide the most protection to airport from complaints	difficulty in determining what is "near the runway" and ability to finance acquisitions; fairness in buying some but not all easements
Rationale: If avigation easements are the most direct method of recording restrictions on property so that title searches can be assured of informing potential property buyers of the existence and meaning of airport impacts, then a policy of consistency should be followed and additional easements obtained.		
4. revise easements not in the <i>clear zone</i> to the least form of intrusive language now held (i.e., a noise easement)	removes some of the easement language most offensive to the community	may be seen by some to remove protective language now held by the County as a matter of legal right