

**January 22, 2014**  
**WPAC & AAC Joint Committee Meeting**

WPAC, In attendance: David Gilmer, Steve Sheehan, Robyn Waxman, Michele Defty  
Absent: Alexandra Latta

AAC, In attendance: Gary Pelfry, Ray Ferrell, Joel Larsen

6:35pm –Call to Order of Aviation Advisory Committee \_ Gary Pelfrey, Chair

Reads a county counsel statement re: holding a “special” meeting:

"County Counsel has confirmed that tonight's meeting has been properly called and noticed. Any additional information needed can be obtained from Senior Deputy County Counsel Phil Pogledich at 530-666-8275.

The chairs and vice chairs of both committees actively participated in agenda setting and agreed to the meeting date and time, and can thus be considered to have called this meeting.

We understand that there still may be an objection to us proceeding tonight. However, in light of County Counsel's opinion, the chairs have agreed to follow County Counsel's advice and conduct this meeting. Any subsequent challenges to the meeting's legality should be taken up afterward with County Counsel.

We strongly believe it is important for the community and our fellow committee members to have the opportunity to comment on the proposed Capital Improvement Program. None of us would be well served otherwise."

6: 36 pm –Call to order of West Plainfield Advisory Committee on Airport Development (WPAC) \_ Michele Defty, Chair

G. Pelfrey: sets meeting rules—

Raise hand, chairs will alternate in identifying who will speak

State your name before you speak

**Public Comment**

*Member of the public (MOP):* County council notice is out of place because it was not sent out publicly

Code 54.59 of Brown Act states:

Special meeting must be called by officer or by majority of members of legislative body; must be posted 24 hours in advance for a special meeting

County posted more than 72 hours in advance without 20-word max, brief general description of agenda items. Review of minutes from last meeting were not on agenda. MOP brought it to county's attention and they sent out another notice with new agenda; which was not posted 72 hours in advance. Unethical and a violation of code.

**Aviation Advisory Committee (AAC)** – no quorum, only 3 members in attendance: Gary Pelfry, Ray Ferrell, and Joel Larsen — informational only for committee, no actions can occur.

*MOP*: needed clarification on quorum membership of AAC

Defty: asks for a move to approve the agenda

Waxman: moves to approve

Gilmer: seconds

All in favor, motion passes

**Item #5: ACIP**

Ervin: presents plan for 2014–2019, similar to prior two years; includes drainage improvements as highest priority.

2 changes: ALP update with fencing. Large airport map is ALP. It's up to date and shows all projects from CIP.

Oct 21: FAA updated protocol that is more complex and requires more details than earlier versions. To proceed with design and construction we must update plan to show retention ponds. FAA not flexible. Preliminary pond design will be completed this year. April will show location of ponds. Constructions will be moved back one year.

Fencing: not on prior ACIP submittals. Long shown on ALP:

1. majority of tenants have changed their minds in the last year about needing fencing. More incursions by trespassers on taxi-ways and at hangars, Vehicles have interfered, fuel thefts, tenants have informal neighborhood watch program. Greater potential for belligerent confrontations.
2. TSA (transportation security agency) who inspect and conduct homeland security have ramped up pressure to fence airports as a measure against terrorism. E.g. Davis Flight school (Pelfrey's business) TSA working with FAA to have Part 145 repair stations. Typically aimed at larger airports, but they are a Part 145 repair facility.
3. Other airports with similar services and level of activity have fences: Davis, Nut Tree, Sac Executive.
4. Fencing does not make impervious surface and doesn't need drainage mitigation.

*MOP*: will people be able to get to businesses?

*Ferrell*: yes

*MOP*: how high and what type of fence?

Ervin: 6 ft and chain link

*MOP*: how will someone get into the fenced area when someone is not there?

*Ervin*: we are working it out, maybe a key card, but a process for it. We have to work it out.

*Ferrell:* typically there's an access gate where the public parks and then a punch code and the pilots would have access to the code.

*MOP:* What will you do with the feed canal? Will you fence it?

*Pelfrey:* I have not seen the engineering design.

*Larsen:* One main purpose is that there are expensive things to have and you don't want to make it easy to drive in and drive out with people's stuff. You want to cut down on vandalism and theft. A pilot who is not based here would have very little reason to be here.

*Pelfrey:* it's also for restricting animals from getting onto the runway.

*MOP:* Speaking of animals, pilots need to leave their dogs home and abide by the rules.

**Fence:** will it meet 51.96 B for grant assurances.

*MOP:* \$35K for a design? Every inch of information is on the FAA site on how it's built so it seems odd to get a plan for \$35K. It's not that difficult, hardly cemented in, doesn't take a scientist to do this. The pilots are concerned about people who fly here for no reason. It's a public airport and they have the right to use this airport.

*MOP:* Fence was brought up at last AAC meeting and Ferrell was against it. It was brought up by a new member of the AAC and they didn't want to put up a fence. All of a sudden we have all this theft and transients but it's probably all the people who are coming onto the facility. It's a half fence, not a perimeter fence. The other (exsiting) fencing does not meet FAA requirements. Animals are on the other side of the airport where there's no fence. This is too expensive.

*Sheehan:* Why doesn't it go along Roads 29 and 95?

*Ervin:* It could be considered in the future. It would meet FAA standard, we have fencing along there anyway. We should have engineer look at that fence and how adequate it is.

*Chamberlain:* This chain link fence is a joke. People come in and steal all the time—they drive their car right through. Behind Lillard Hall is open without fencing so that someone can just drive right in and onto to the runway. Chain link fencing parts like a curtain.

*MOP:* FAA requires certain parameters to work around. We don't have a choice. If you read fencing the FAA regs, it's simple—we don't need to pay someone to design it. Stop throwing money away.

*Defty:* I was also thinking about the last AA C meeting and like others I remember there was general consensus that what AAC wanted were gates. Are we doing this because there's a potential to ask for money and because we can't move forward because of the drainage drawings, and suddenly there's a safety issue? No mention of safety at last meeting. It's hard to believe that we've gone from an OK situation to a very dangerous one.

*Pelfry:* Some of this comes from me. I've asked people, "has it gone well?" and I had to call the sheriff. People are driving in and they drive out and they're on the taxiway and they don't know it. I am pressing for better security— it seems like a prudent thing to do.

*MOP:* what sorts of security do you have? Signs that say "runway" or "surveillance area"?

*Pelfry:* no trespassing signs have been noted. We have 16 cameras and they only cover so much.

*Ervin:* There was a B-25 aircraft doing a Touch & Go and the front wheel went flat on him. They taxied over and it's sitting there (points beyond Fire Station). It's an attractive nuisance. It's not protected, but it will leave this weekend. It's caused a lot of consternation.

*Defty:* why are gates at all roadway access points not sufficient?

*Ervin:* Agreed, but gates are a deterrent, depending on the design. This is an opportunity because we can get the FAA to fund it. We might try a phased approach to this one with gates first.

*MOP:* when you build hangars that are so close and pilots are using taxiways to go from one end of airport to the other, of course you will have problems. You created your own problem with no planning in the layout. Mead and Hunt + county is to blame.

*Defty:* Design of runway rehabilitation question from 2019 ACIP: Error on last page of board letter: 2.5 inch overlay vs 25 inch overlay. Which is correct?

*Wes :* I will fix that before submitting.

*MOP:* Dane Westerdahl told you that three meetings ago.

*Defty:* What is purpose of repaving?

*Ervin:* runway was repaved in 2009 because of deterioration. FAA requires a pavement management program. We have to monitor condition of runway and note deterioration. Runway overlay is simply programmed for those years with expectation that it will need an overlay by then. (2019)

*Defty:* how long will it last?

*Larsen:* 10 years. Compare it to roads and their need for maintenance.

*Defty:* by adding 2.5 inches does it also increase capacity for heavier aircraft?

*Ervin:* Not aware of that, and it is not the intent of this. I can ask engineers though.

*Defty:* main reason is for safety and deterioration, not capacity?

*MOP:* frequency of use would be correlated with deterioration.

*Ervin:* As well as sun, weather and frequency of use.

*Waxman:* What are the results of the other drainage studies that we've conducted? Would they agree with this new proposal to amend the ALP? Would Ed Ketchum (water engineer working with county) agree that detention ponds are the right answer to the flooding?

*Ervin:* yes, they all agree. Trying to get in touch with Ed Ketchum to see if he would agree. This price tag for the ALP drawing is from FAA.

*MOP:* What about birds?

*MOP:* 2005 drainage plans had drainage ponds and FAA didn't like it. They have taken big steps in alleviating bird problems. To put any holding pond on this airport will attract birds. Ponds will not solve the problem. It's a waste of money.

*Sheehan:* Last overlay was in 2009. When was the one before then?

*Ervin:* runway was heavily cracked and deteriorated.

*Ferrell:* long, long ago.

*Pelfrey:* weeds and grass started moving across and growing through the runway.

*Chamberlain:* edges were like an old county road. We spent \$2 million to upgrade runway b/c they thought they would be problems underneath, but there wasn't. What happened to the \$2Mil?

*Ferrell:* but it will be 10 years since last overlay.

*Ervin:* estimates of dollar amounts are there (in ACIP). FAA is ok reducing so these are inflated numbers b/c FAA will not make an increase, only a reduction. The actual amounts are usually less. FAA monitors that and requires us to report.

*MOP:* \$30k for design should be looked at and should be reduced.

*MOP:* Core samples were taken with soil analysis. Could that be used as a baseline for runway improvements?

*Ervin:* it could be and should be.

*MOP:* my soil is not stable. It's all clay.

*MOP:* wants to clarify first statement: nothing is being added. Yes, it may be shrinking and expanding. But soil analysis may be a baseline.

*Pelfrey:* addresses AAC: are there any questions or comments about 2014–2019 CIP? (no reply)

*Ferrell:* I am in favor of supporting it.

*Pelfrey:* I am in favor of supporting it.

*MOP:* You should make incident reports so that it can support future needs for fencing. Keep a log.

*Pelfry:* we do.

*Waxman:* I am uncomfortable with the fencing only covering half of the airport. It has the illusion of protecting private property with public funds. If you're interested in safety, the fence should go around the entire airport where the public lives and can access the property.

*Sheehan:* I am in general agreement with Waxman.

*Gilmer:* it should be done in concert with AAC.

*Ferrell:* we are separate committees— you vote the way you like. (in response to Gilmer).

*Gilmer:* I see Ray's point.

*Larsen:* part of approval is to approve the design of it. We are just approving the idea of a design.

*Waxman:* It specifically says "drainage ponds"

*Defty:* I'm confused. We pay to have drainage ponds included on map and FAA says we don't want drainage ponds.

*Ervin:* they will tell us during the 30-step approval process if drainage ponds are ok.

*MOP:* Cart before the horse. Let's do the infrastructure first.

*MOP:* You don't have to ask a wildlife expert. Where you have water, you have birds. You need a pumping station or move the water into a slough or Putah Creek.

*Ferrell:* we're trying to micro-manage here. But we're trying to move forward and get funding to get the studies done, designs done. We can't wait until the design is complete.

*Chamberlain:* runway: even though it's clay, west of here is a big hole (5-10 acres, 20 ft deep) the pits been dug out. Above that is Meyer's clay. The runways and taxiways don't flood. The water comes down from the hills and sloughs overflow. Irrigation canal is restrictive and ones on the west are big but get smaller and smaller as it comes this way. It overflows everything in a big storm.

*Defty:* can you apply with out naming "detention ponds"? Can it be money for a drainage solution?

*Ervin:* I'll ask Mead and Hunt, but I believe the CIP is flexible enough to change. FAA will not fund drainage ponds unless it's in the capital improvement program and drawing.

*MOP:* proposal will take care of the airport with growth that I think will happen. Set up a foundation for when the Davis airport closes. It's my opinion about a trend that's happening in the aviation industry.

*MOP:* Talking about long term planning ... Airport Master Plan is 15 years old. The plan identified many problems with this airport that needed modification. These problems existed 15 years ago. No action has been taken for long-term planning and I have no faith that it will change.

*MOP:* This is a good point. Do we have a cap on the usage of this airport? Is there a limit to how many landings or do we need a tower? If we do get increased traffic, is there a cap?

*Ervin:* master plan does have an upper limit for traffic and based aircraft.

*MOP:* will firestation move?

*Pelfry:* come to next public workshop where we talk about this.

*Waxman:* move to support 2014 ALP Update provided there is removal of specific wording about "Detention Ponds".

*Sheehan:* seconds

All in favor.

*Sheehan:* Moves to start with gates to no support for the fencing project.

*Gilmer:* second

All in favor

*Sheehan:* in excess of \$2M for airport construction without substantial growth at airport.

*Defty:* we have not seen the economic results of improvements. Seems to be for a few people's benefit.

*Waxman:* I am uncomfortable spending this amount of money every 10 years. That money could be helping elsewhere.

*MOP:* It comes out to \$7 per landing. We can see the development of area. Is use of airport increasing? Suggests taking counts every year to inform ourselves every year.

*MOP:* I just did the math, it' \$24 per landing

*MOP:* county sells people permits for large fees. Inspections are covered by fees. Do the people who come in here and land, do they pay enough money to cover these things?

*Ferrell:* all the funding that comes here is generated through aircraft fuel sales tax. It comes back to us this way. There are also local, county and state taxes added to it. None of those funds show up in the budget to this airport.

*MOP:* \$2M is only 10% that the FAA covers?

*MOP:* no it's 90% that the FAA covers.

*MOP:* it's not just fuel tax that funds this. It's ticket tax (airline). It's not just aviation fuel. There are a number of tax-based fees that go into this foundation.

*Pelfrey:* We can keep it as a safe environment and we can do preventative maintenance and it comes back as a multiplier later.

*Waxman:* Move to not approve \$2M for new runway overlay.

Sheehan: second

Gilmer: abstention

3 approve, it passes.

*MOP:* write a note to supervisors with your votes.

**Item #6:**

Plane counts

*Waxman:* background is that the number of operations we have are from a 1997 count. UC Davis class sat at the airport for a week and counted planes only during the day. This data was extrapolated to include night time and then year-round. Then it was extrapolated to make a prediction for 2015 of 110,000 operations / year.

Thanks participants. Explains the online operations count and how the data was collected via Wes and other individuals who monitored 6 days each. An operation is a landing or a take-offs. Touch & gos are counted as two operations in our study. The data does not include aircraft without transponders, which is a violation of FAA requirements

*Ferrell:* that is incorrect information. It is not a violation.

*Waxman:* will check more into whether it is or not. Continues: military aircraft who erase their flight from the webtrak system are also not recorded.

*Waxman* suggests that we figure out a percentage missing by comparing Ferrell's and Pelfrey's plane records to the same days the group counted to see how many are missing. We will assume they don't have transponders on.

*Pelfrey:* I don't keep a record of flights. I only keep a record of fuel sales. Summer is my slow time of year. School is out of session.

*Wes:* form 50-10,, 70,000 operations. Only found one week of data from students study.

*MOP:* FAA glossary site for Touch & Go. : "An operation by an aircraft that lands and departs."

*Waxman:* We do not know how the students counted Touch & Gos— we do not know if we are comparing apples to apples in this study, but we do know that the operations are far less than predicted. Maybe because of 9-11, maybe because of the economy.

*MOP:* (to Ferrell) "Does 95 flights per day sounds like the right number?"

*Ferrell:* "yes, more or less."

*MOP:* Do you think the airport usage has gone down by half?

*Ferrell:* it has gone down by some over the years. The training schools have closed: JAL out of Napa Valley is closed.

*MOP :* What is the 9-11 relationship to the lower than estimated number?

*Ferrell:* economic downturn and 9-11 caused aviation to take a downturn. Training centers closed.

*MOP:* Ray, the numbers suggest about a 50% decrease in 15 years. Do you think that's about right?

*Ferrell:* no, I don't think it's been that much.

*MOP:* are we still using the same figures?

*Ervin:* the numbers have not been changed in a long time.

*MOP:* should we update the numbers?

*Ervin:* that would be very enlightening and good. But they don't use the numbers in the applications. Sac exec airport had 123,000/year. Now they have 92,000 per year. It dropped 30% or so over that timeframe. Most airports have dropped that amount. These numbers are consistent with that trend.

*Pelfrey:* time period for slow time is when you picked because they're in school. Fuel sales dropped during summer.

*Ferrell:* jump planes have us change the frequency.

*Waxman:* we could compare the flight records from Ray's flights to our days to see a general percentage of what's missing.

*MOP:* these numbers are very provocative. Early estimates are that far off? I would discard the original data, as a scientist, when I hear that it was a group of students who collected data for one week. How many of the 32,000 flights are Yolo County

folks? The data doesn't allow us to identify the planes. Are we spending our tax dollars on other people from other places or Yolo County?

*Ferrell*: one correction. The airport serves people from all over just like highways.

*MOP*: how much tax dollars does that cost per operation for the 1.6M runway?—\$24 per operation. Should we re-think if we should be a part of this infrastructure. I would love to hear the committee make a motion that the county undertake an analysis of operation at this county airport, including the number type and where the aircraft is coming from.

*Waxman*: offers to prepare the findings for the BOS.

*Sheehan*: moves to submit this plane count information to BOS

*Gilmer*: seconds

All in favor.

*Waxman*: Move to adjourn

*Sheehan*: second

All in favor.

(sorry\_ I didn't record the time we adjourned)

**Minutes submitted by Robyn Waxman**