

Minutes
Joint Meeting -- Aviation Advisory/Airport Development Advisory Committees
January 20, 1999

Time convened: 7:42 p.m. ...

Committee Members:

AAC

ADAC

Kanoff	no	Buchan	no
Hancock	no	McLin	yes
Merwin	yes	Wood	yes
Kinkle	no	Parrella	yes
Morris	yes		

Staff present: Ott, GSA

Neither committee had a quorum and the meeting became a general discussion of the topic avigation easements.

Sub-committee members led the discussion with members present and the audience.

Eleanor Wood believed that notice constituted legal notice and provided the County all the protection needed. She also believed that Option 2 (retain easements in clear zones and release all others) was the only rational

Some members present believed that it would more effective to made a zoning issue since if the County intends additional zoning restrictions, it should be via zoning regulations.

Debbie Parrella wants the County to make a clear statement how easements will be obtained in the future and under what conditions. The purpose of the debate is to put this issue to rest.

Sharon McLin believed that Option 2 was best and then Option 4 (revising easements not in the Clear Zone to the least form of intrusive language now held, i.e., a noise easement) since Option 4 did provide a level of protection which Option 2 may not be seen to provide.

Committee members asked that a map be provided showing easements now held.

These options were to be brought back to a future joint meeting for additional review and comment.

July 5, 1999

To: Members of the Aviation Advisory Committee and Airport Development Advisory Committee

Subject: Background Materials for the July 13th Meeting

The attached information relates to aviation easements on the July 13th joint committee meeting. Attached is a map requested by the committee which shows the location of existing easements; the location of easements approved by the Planning Commission but not yet executed; a comparison of language of easements; and, an outline of the easement agreed by the property owner in the south clear zone of the airport as described in the 1998 Airport Specific Plan.

Also attached is a copy of the draft Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update noted in the agenda for that evening. Dave Boyer from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments will be present to discuss the plan in detail.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Keith Ott", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Keith Ott

Avigation Easements Options

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 <i>obtain new and</i>	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

Rationale: As a matter of fairness to property owners, bring existing easements not in the *clear zone* to the same degree of property rights intrusion (i.e., noise easements).

Public Notice

**regarding the Yolo County Airport
located at County Roads 29 and 95**

- 1. The County of Yolo owns and operates a general aviation airport under the authority and regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) FAR Parts 77, 91 & 150 (at www.faa.gov/avr/AFS/FARS) and the State Aeronautical Act (at www.leginfo.ca.gov Div 9 Public Utilities Code).**
- 2. An Airport Specific Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 23, 1998 under the provisions of these regulations and which may be amended thereafter.**
- 3. Public law and regulations exist to protect persons living in the vicinity of airports as well as authorize airport use and safeguard airspace for aircraft. Those regulations can be found in FAR 91 and 150, the state Act, the Yolo County Code (chapter 4-5) and the Airport Policies Manual available without charge to the public and airport users.**
- 4. Public law provides for the free and unobstructed flight by aircraft through airspace over and around property within a radius of 10,000 ft centered on the runway and from the ground to 150 ft in elevation above the runway.**
- 5. The right of flight by aircraft includes the right of safe access to public airports without restriction or hazard.**
- 6. Public law and regulations provide that no use of airspace below 150 ft in elevation (descending to the ground in the clear zones and primary surface of the runway) within 10,000 ft of the runway centerline will interfere with the right of flight.**
- 7. Standards for determining obstructions to air navigation for existing or proposed man-made objects, objects of natural growth, and terrain are defined in FAA FAR Part 77.**
- 8. The approach and departure altitudes and traffic pattern, as well as other policies, are described in the County Code and the Airport Policies Manual.**
- 9. The state of California noise standard governing the operation of aircraft and aircraft engines for persons living in the vicinity of airports is CNEL 65 dB (Calif Code of Regulations §5012).**

This public notice is being made in connection with the release of certain aviation easements now held by the County. Grantors of such easements have been directly noticed of this action. This notice is also being directly communicated to owners of property within 10,000 ft of the centerline of the Yolo County Airport. Further information can be obtained by contacting the General Services Agency at 625 Court St, Woodland, CA 95695 (530-666-8115).

The Yolo County *Clear Zones*

The *clear zones* for the Yolo County Airport are defined on page 6-4 of the adopted Airport Specific Plan (master plan section) and exhibit 6-1; those areas are termed *Runway Protection Zones* (RPZ).

The RPZ is a trapezoidal area at ground level that begins 200 feet beyond the threshold of the runway and is centered on the runway centerline. The width (east-west) of the trapezoid closest to the runway is 500 ft. The width (east-west) of the trapezoid furthest from the runway is 1,010 ft. The sides (north-south) of the trapezoid are 1,700 ft. See the attached layout plan.

The two principal purposes of an RPZ are to protect runway approaches by minimizing development and to enhance safety by limiting concentrations of populations in these areas.¹

¹1998 Airport Specific Plan, p. 6-4 of the master plan section.