

**March 18, 2015**  
**WPAC & AAC Joint Committee Meeting**

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

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

6:37pm –Call to Order of WPAC, M Defty

6:37 pm Aviation Advisory Committee \_ Gary Pelfrey, Chair

Introductions of committee members

Guests: Dave Dietz, Corbin Smith from Mead & Hunt

G. Pefrey—

**Item 3:**

Public comment: raise hand and be recognized by member of committee. Apologies in advance for having to remind you to stick to the agenda. This discussion is for items not on the agenda.

MOP: Last meeting in January was a disgrace because of all the violations. MOP notified the county of violations, including bullying (§54954.2) (a), voting on non-action agenda items (§ 54954.3)(a), and put ACIP on consent calendar for the January 27, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting. The AAC minutes from January 2014 is filled with errors, including a committee member listed as present who was not in attendance. The AAC didn't have a quorum at that meeting so they should have adjourned immediately, but the county staff allowed the meeting to proceed. The AAC should have no minutes to file.

County must oversee meetings that adhere to the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order.

MOP: one quick point: we've been getting tons of plans and papers and updates, but we are still working with a master plan that is over 20 years old and in its own text says it needs to be updated. An ad hoc committee met in 1994 with airport interests. Everything we're seeing tonight is based on a planning process that has been set out in writing from deep dark past and that we're working with 25-year old information. All of these that we've seen over the last years have been based on old plans that have never been evaluated.

MOP: Can we make comments along the way? It's odd to make comments only at the beginning. Our interests are in maintaining our fire dept, the heart of this community and this hall which has served many purposes to this community. We still don't know what the plans are for these buildings. It's important to us that they

be maintained. If these plans have us lose the heart of our community, it doesn't make sense to me that we can have buildings all over but we can't have these two buildings. History shows that they have not been a problem. We have not had airplanes run into them. The county needs to find a way to separate this strip of land off and give it to a non-profit. This has been a very important part of our community. We need to find a way. The people who have lived here for generations need to be considered. The plan doesn't serve anyone in this community otherwise. It takes away property value and creates a nuisance. Are we going to be paid back? This is a taking of our rights as property owners. It is something that needs to be addressed and not shoved to the side. We need to see it in writing.

G. Pelfrey: to answer your first question: after Mead and Hunt's presentation, our committees will discuss and then there will be open public comment. A lot of your questions will be answered through this.

MOP: Do these comments fall into the air or do these comments need to be addressed? The community's concerns are important to us. How will you respond to these comments?

G.Pelfrey: these are public comments so a lot will be addressed. As we get to the end, we have county staff here and they are aware of your questions and comments.

MOP: Brown Act is mentioned time and time again but it is not being adhered to. No need to follow it now. Does one have to sue for our county reps to adhere to the law? Are you prepared to follow the Brown Act?

G. Pelfrey: We are following the Brown Act.

MOP: In the last couple of days I've been corresponding with Mindi Nunez. Can you explain the rules for the membership of the two committees when the terms expire? Who should no longer be sitting because their terms have expired?

G. Pelfrey: I will address it. There are two different rule sets for each committee. WPAC allows the members to remain past their term. When the AAC there is a period of time before you can fill that term again. Ray will not be part of our quorum and will not be voting. Ray will be providing me with information when I have questions. There are two different rule sets and we don't know why, but we're abiding by them.

MOP: What are the prerequisites for each of the committees?

G.Pelfrey: It's on the website.

MOP: Why is Ray at the table? It doesn't seem proper.

Ray Ferrell moves to the public seating.

MOP: There were a lot of jets a couple of weekends ago. Is this an indication of the type of plane that will be taking off and landing? Are there sound limits?

G.Pelfrey: I am not aware of any limits on the sound. There were jets landing. This is what can happen at an airport.

MOP: They were very different from the other planes in this area. It hurt my ears. Is this the type of plane that will be taking off and landing?

G. Pelfrey: yes, this is an example. The regulations for takeoff and landing are on the website. There are limitations on when they can practice.

MOP: When most of us moved out here, we have propeller airplanes taking off from there. You want to make this runway so that it can handle larger jets. You bring larger jets out here, we will not be able to live here and everyone will have to move. You will make this into an airport that we didn't sign up for. This is going in the wrong direction for the community.

**Item 4**— approval of the agenda.

G. Pelfrey: AAC has a quorum.

MOP: no you don't. You need four. There are seven seats on the committee and there are only 3 at the table.

Mindi: It's a majority of the members. There are a majority of the members present since 2 have been removed.

G. Pelfrey: Public Comment is over.

M Defty: who is the definitive voice here?

Mindi Nunez: We will get a written notice from the county council.

Latta: What should we do without definitive word?

Mindi Nunez: Gary gets to decide.

G. Pelfrey: Approve the agenda? All in favor.

M.Defty: move to approve? Latta moves, Dave seconds. All in favor.

**Item 5**— approve meeting minutes from January 22, 2014

Waxman (to Larson) : You want to approve minutes from a meeting you didn't attend?

Larson: Member can approve minutes from a meeting he wasn't at, according to county council. I've been on many committees that do that.

G. Pelfrey: We will receive and file these minutes without voting.

Defty: WPAC did have quorum at both meetings— Jan 22, 2014

Waxman: moves to approve, Dave seconds. All in favor.

Jan 21, 2015— Dave moves and Defty seconds approval of the minutes. All in favor.

**Item 6** : Draft update to ALP

Pelfrey: Mead and Hunt will present and we will speak amongst ourselves and ask questions. After then, we will open for public discussion. Please save your comments and questions until then. Then committees will discuss and make motions if needed.

Mead and Hunt (Dave Deitz):

I would like to move from topic to topic. To try to make this more satisfactory, we've changed the format by talking about the issue about hall and firehouse and the reference from B-II to C-II. Overview of Corbitt's graphics and he will walk you through the ALP. We can zoom in for details.

Deliverables:

Update ALP.

Airport layout plan set— "a 7-sheet monster." It includes the narrative report (FAA term) that looks like a 20 page executive summary. This fits in the master plan unless there's a major change to the airport. It's an update to the master plan. It's unlikely that the master plan will be updated so the ALP will help to freshen the master plan. These days they are seldom updated. Incremental changes and refinements are done with ALP.

Both drafts show the hall and firehouse as being removed. History: buildings are technically obstructions. Airspace needs to be protected since the 50's. What has changed is that the FAA's interpretations

Non-precision approaches only get you to 1,000 feet elevation and then you must see the airport. This airport's non-precision approach needs runways space at end of airport. Things that are lateral to airport must be removed. The FAA has no priority to do anything with these structures. This is a paper exercise so that we can show how we will meet the standards. We will live for a ripe old age with these buildings intact. The FAA can change their interpretations to have them removed. These structures can be replaced in another part of the facility. What I suggest be done: there's a site in the NE corner of the airport with a big parcel where the

buildings can go with good street access. Let's put that on the ALP just in case FAA wants to relocate it. Then we will ask for a grant to move it. That's the way to do this: have something on the plan and long approved so if we want to take action to do it, it's there. It will leave us more protected because the buildings will be on the ALP. We could redesign a new facility in 10-20 years when we need to move them.

Pelfrey: Will red obstruction lights on the buildings solve the problem?

M&H: it might. It might be adequate at the time the FAA will ask.

7460 process: airspace specialist in this region does a formal analysis and issues a report on what needs to be done. They can decide that with a non-precision approach a red light will be sufficient because they can see it from 1,000 feet. I don't recommend doing that now because you'll draw attention to it. FAA is more concerned with other things for aeronautical uses. They won't notice it without the red light, but they might with a red light on it.

Latta: what determines what is a lateral obstruction?

M& H: distance from runway.

Latta: what is the distance?

M/H: There are 7-pages because of FAA is chasing their own tail. (shows diagram) The buildings on aviation side (East side) is several hundred feet further from airport.

MOP: 400 ft is obstruction free zone.

MOP: If FAA has requirements about fire equipment? What would that mean?

M/H: oddly enough, there is no requirement. It's highly desirable. There is zero requirement.

MOP: We have limited foam. We have foam, but not training in putting out a jet fire.

Waxman: What is the next closest fire station?

MOP: Travis and McClellan.

MOP: As I recall from reading all the plans, these requirements that cause these buildings to be a problem is a C-II classification.

M/H: it's driven by instrument approach — GPS

MOP: building was ok under some classification, but not under others.

M/H: obstacle free zones are driven by those. The airspace is driven by the fact that is it over 12,500 lbs.

MOP: slopes have changed?

M/H: the only thing that hasn't changed is airspace surfaces.

MOP: if these are small changes, how has lots changed since master plan?

M/H: relocation. Airspace is the problem. FAA will not accept obstructions without dispositions. Table has it to be removed. Let's show where it would go. It must stay as "to be removed." The FAA will not accept the document without that.

MOP: ALP is a freshening up of Master Plan. It seems odd that you say that because you are circumventing EIR process. When you add buildings, the ERA is a driving factor of how the airport would be developed. We are developing the airport without infrastructure first. We are building things that do not meet EIR recommendations. We are overriding master plan and going to have problems down the road. There will be a new environmental document

MOP: is anybody considering the feasibility of moving the runway vs rebuilding the buildings?

M/H: it's a couple of million dollars of moving concrete. The FAA would not be likely to fund that investment. Our initial thought is that it's unlikely to happen but let's show something on the plan.

MOP: I am a resident and the fire chief. 7460 process: didn't we just go through this process? We cut trees and flagpoles are too tall. Or was that something different?

M/H: obstruction survey done 5 years ago and that identified things not in the airspace plan. Trees must come down or we will limit use of airport. Got grant to cut trees. This came out of airspace plan.

MOP: FAA funds will be available or might be available for moving buildings? What's the likelihood? If relocation is not on document, there's no possibility to get grant to move buildings.

M/H: Easier if it's on ALP, but not a deal-killer if it's not on there. Grant process is a bit of a poker game. Whether or not they will do it depends on what's going on in aviation system. They **focus** on certain topics over the years. I can't guess what the eligibility will be because this won't happen for 5 or 10 years.

MOP: what if they deny the grant?

M/H: Call congressional reps and complain.

MOP: This affects our insurance rates too.

MOP: you could calculate the FAA fundable score for this right now.

M/H: If this was competitive, this would get a low national priority rank. Because they're looking at maintenance.

MOP: When is executive summary available?

M/H: Doesn't exist yet. Will get it to staff for review — April 9<sup>th</sup>.

MOP: by putting this on as a possibility and placing it on a map. What kinds of studies are done? What that might do to that environment?

M/H: This project would be subject to CEQA. My guess is that it will be a mitigated negative declaration.

MOP: will this go on plan without study?

M/H: plan will be subject to CEQA document. We will put a blob on that area to determine where it is. You might want a different configuration of what it looks like so we'll just do a blob.

MOP: If these building removed, would any buildings be able to go here?

M/H: No. Maybe a small pump house but not a regular building.

MOP: For an airport with non-precision approach, is the aircraft type limited?

M/H: no.

MOP: You said that master plans aren't changed often?

M/H: Unless you're changing something drastically, you would never do one again.

MOP: How many have been done in the last years?

M/H: We are doing one for Truckee because there's a big change. South Tahoe is the other one.

MOP: how far away do the buildings need to be?

M/H: it's a height restriction that's different depending on where you are. The first 400 feet is flat and then it goes up in ratios.

MOP: There are minor updates without master plans. How do we get accurate count of traffic that drives these decisions?

MOP: The county plan could affect where we relocate.

M/H: most county plans put a hole in their plan for where the airport fits. We need guidance to do this. It's a limbo suggestion and it's not tidy.

MOP: You've known for how long it's been an obstruction? You can understand our dismay that this appears to be an end-run to move the fire department closer to them.

M/H: we figured this out a week ago. We wanted to come up with something that gave you some comfort.

MOP: We've been told in the past that it's not going to happen.

M/H: We think this is a nice tidy technical solution but we don't think it's going to happen either.

Defty: what would be a large enough change that would require a new master plan?

M/H: runway extension or moving the runway.

Defty: moving the road over?

M/H: no.

Scribner: FAA deemed this a problem because of GPS approaches. They are looking at everything and they fly around make sure the approaches are safe. The FAA can say it's got to go. There's no environmental impact. Let's get ahead of things and move it somewhere. Get it in the clock so if something happens later we can say HEY— we planned this a long time ago. It's an obstruction but nobody paid any attention to it.

Defty: would firehouse in NE corner work?

Fire Chief: We need to be on the road somewhere so volunteers don't have to drive all the way down the road and back down the road again Anything on the edge of 95 or 29 would be the best locations.

M/H: We need to talk to the fire chief and others + a small list of people to see if the idea will work in the real world. We would need a Plan C.

Defty: I find it extremely surprising that our fire chief has not been contacted once my M/H and the county.



M/H: Because our expectation is that it would never come up in the real world, we didn't do much. We think the odds are remote that this is an issue. I'm not saying don't worry about. I want a technical solution. We have to talk to people – it's not fully fleshed out. We are a non-airline airport and we are dependent on grants. If they declare it an obstruction, removal is a higher priority.

MOP: Obstruction funds have a higher priority, would it be possible that they will remove it?

M/H: The FAA cannot remove the firehouse. The county can.

Latta: How specific does the relation area have to be described?

M/H: It doesn't. It's a good thing. We're confident that we have a site that will work in real world. If we don't have a site or data then we will have a note that it will be relocated.

Latta: You are providing the path for this scenario. The FAA Funding can pony up the 10% to make it happen. The community members like to see a guarantee that this will happen (the move of the fire station).

M/H: The BOS cannot guarantee that it will happen. They cannot obligate future boards.

Waxman: Could the fire station be removed and not replaced?

M/H: It could happen. The things attached to the ground are not regulatory. It's contractual. If you take our money, you will do the following. Worse case scenario: they say it's your nickel. I see this as a very small possibility.

Latta: Is there anyone in the community that uses Lillard Hall who can provide some input about what a relocated facility would look like?

MOP: 4-H, residents, fire house training, meetings... we use it every week.

MOP: I question the suitability of a building used by children when it's next to a gun range.

MOP: will firing range be affected?

M/H: Trees were removed, but range is not. It's historically common at airports this size.

M/H:

### **Airport Reference Code (ARC)**

A runway reference code. The difference between B (approach speed and wingspan). Category C is faster and wider wingspan. Higher landing speed.

Approach speed is difference. There's no connection between B and C with height stuff. It affects on-airport design issues. There is a graded area around the runway like a highway has a shoulder. B has a narrow shoulder. C gets dramatically bigger. Runway safety area (shoulder) are only 240 ft beyond end of runway. C goes from 240 to 1,000 ft from end of runway.

Hard to see but area (points to end of runway) green line is runway safety area. It's 400 ft beyond the end of the runway. That's category B aircraft. The areas farmed would need to be made smooth to extend the runway. Airport reference codes have no effect on who uses the airport. Runway safety area is what let's pilots know if they can land a fast jet.

Once you've built the runway, anyone who fits can use it. (weight and size) Communities don't have the right to say who can land or if there are curfews. US does not have curfews. Those are the rules. They don't have to design it for a big plane, but if someone wants to come they are free to come. This facility exists as is, there's no proposal to change the runway length. The aircraft type has changed over time, maybe because of the casino. Once you build it and it has physical capabilities, they can come.

MOP: A question and comment: whose idea is it that we've got to do this?

M/H: creating these larger safety areas are a safety measure. Once you are beyond 500 operations you need to have that infrastructure. There's no obligation by county because there are not 500 operations of jets that size. The FAA does not regulate this airport directly. If this airport was seeing C aircraft, the county would get a letter saying they need to grade the area. This is a safety feature.

MOP: you're inviting them to come and use the airport.

M/H: road analogy: small aircraft are like auto with joy ride. Corporate jets come here because someone has a destination nearby. A hangar is an attraction. But has nothing to do with transient use. They need a runway and a place to park/fuel. Large aircraft are transient. Hangars are not. They are coming here because of something nearby.

Defty: You're saying that most jet traffic is transient. A lot of the jet traffic is coming here for repair. They are not just landing one time and taking off, they are coming here for repairs and many take offs and landings occur to make sure the repairs are successful. They are not coming here once and leaving once.

M/H: they need an annual inspection. A business that serves those people is an attractant. What do we want to use this airport for? That's a BOS decision and policy choice. Airport has authority on how the airport is used on the ground. Run-ups can be done during certain hours, like a noise ordinance.

MOP: This is a stab in the back. UC Davis mediators assured us that we would not seek C-II status. We could assume that it could never be changed.

M/H: We don't recommend leaving it out because it's a safety measure. You could try to limit facilities that serve them, but this is a safety issue.

MOP: there are a number of issues: master plan. No data on the master plan came from this airport. Numbers are simulated. The community is not in favor of a C-II airport. The county does not represent the community. They wish to take the approach that this airport become a money making institution. We see an addition of layering of 2.5 inches year after year. It's creating a base for larger aircraft. The community doesn't want it, but the businesses want the jets to repair it. The county wants to hand this over and above the community wishes. Every time we do an overlay, we create a weight issue to build up to the C-II class.

MOP: Strengthen runway on document. Why?

G.Pelfry: allow M/H to answer the question first.

M/H: presently the runway is rated at 75,000 single wheel. This will accommodate an intercontinental aircraft. The base material and asphalt will degrade. An overlay is for protection. It goes over a slurry seal that fills in cracks. There may or may not be any change in strength of overlap. Asphalt degrades. Overlay stabilizes it. Reality is the pavement needs to be stabilized. We need to recalculate to see if the overlay has changed anything. You need to do something around 5-years to get a 20-year life on the asphalt. Increasing strength has nothing to do with C classification. C is 25,000 lb range. You're at 75,000 lbs. What do you want to achieve? The overlay isn't going to change the strength of pavement. You're not going to be attractive to the larger aircraft at only 6,000 ft runway.

MOP: Why do we need 2.5 inches with only 35,000 operations per year?

M/H: Asphalt ages faster when it's not used. Your pavement was at 98,000 lbs the last time the master plan was done. This information does go to pavement. Overlay is not going to do anything to the runway.

MOP: Ask the county staff if they could address the issues about how the C-II was not in the works. We feel betrayed.

Nunez: We are not planning a C-II airport.

MOP: why is it in the proposal?

M/H: I don't recommend removing it.

Latta: you would not recommend that because of safety?

M/H: The BOS decides what to do with it.

MOP: moving the buildings are part of C-II upgrade?

MOP: We've heard from county staff that there's no C-II category move. It seems only fair that when they take this to the planner, the planner doesn't list C-II on the future column. You've been informed that the future is C-II?

M/H: The county can direct us to take it off. We are adopting a carry-over plan.

MOP: moving the road is a C-II requirement?

M/H: Yes, it is. The road needs to move to get the full 1,000 feet. This is consistent with C-II.

Defty: have you ever been told by the county that they're not interested in moving to a C-II airport?

M/H: This is a long-term plan for the airport. Anyone can add it back in or take it out. Unless you're at 500 operations, it won't happen. If the BOS doesn't want to go there, we could give them a list of things to do that will make that happen like not sell jet fuel.

Larsen: a C-II aircraft can land today? If they exceed 500 / year then we're required to have 1,000 foot run-overs.

M/H: nobody is counting aircraft. But if they are exceeding, then yes there is an expectation that these upgrades will happen.

Larsen: the safety issue is the same whether there is one or 500 C-II aircraft.

M/H: FAA is not regulatory, they are contractual.

MOP: I operate an airplane that is 1,100 lbs. It makes no noise. The 1,000 ft of graded area is much safer for me. Take a little land out of farming to make it safer. I want to live if there's a power failure.

MOP: Other airports have longer runways? Could we be safe and not go to C-II? Motivation is financial, not safety issue. Why are we doing something that other airports are not doing?

M/H: They don't have the mix of aircraft we do.

MOP: We don't know what type of aircraft we have.

M/H: nobody counts types of aircraft by category or ARC.

Defty: Do you know if this airport is dangerous?

M/H: no, the issues were the trees off the north end and they are gone now.

Defty: I'm talking about the graded areas on the ends. I don't know of too many problems in 20 years.

M/H: one reason the US has a good safety record is b/c the FAA has strong scrutiny with safety efforts. It's designed for the least capable pilot. It's designed based on worse case scenario. There's nothing here that is unusual like the Grand Canyon. There's not a hazard that we're fixing.

Defty: it's not more dangerous?

M/H: yes, it is. The stats are low, but the consequences are high. When you get to 500 category C aircraft, we need to go to the next safety area.

### **Proposed Changes to ALP**

Corbitt- I'm going to walk through the changes to the ALP:

- shift in the road by 30 feet. if C-II designation happened. In orange. It's unknown if or when that will happen.

—

MOP: could you add 30 feet onto other side of road?

M/H: yes, that's an option. But it's more expensive and would change airspace and instrument approaches.

Latta: This would occur if the FAA came and said you're a C-II airport. Is this true with grading project?

M/H: The C-II designation is determined by FAA based on 500 operations, not county.

MOP: These become part of the ACIP.

M/H: If the FAA says they want it resolved, then we would need to budget for it. ACIP has a 5-year window.

MOP: this shows perimeter fence all the way around.

M/H: fencing is separate project underway. We have documents that we've delivered to county. Once it's finalized it will be on here.

MOP: fence required to be a B or C?

M/H: FAA has security desires, it's not a B or C category. FAA wants to see a secure facility.

Added access points around the parking area. Hangars in different configurations. Light blue is proposed hangar sites. Dark blue is existing hangars. Yellow is asphalt for parking.

Pelfrey: there's a park space allocated with trees. Where the water pumps are. It's designated as long as I can remember as a park with picnic tables. It's currently undeveloped with high grass.

MOP: that park was designated 24 years ago on the master plan to be a fly in area for camping.

MOP: what's the calculated run off from new surfaces?

M/H: We were asked to come up with spaces for hangars.

Pelfrey: laying out the hangars— there's an elevation design so there's not one hangar bigger than another?

Waxman: How many of the new hangars can accommodate C-II aircraft?

M/H: 7 hangars so far. We designed it so that hangars fit well.

MOP: It looks to me that you've more than doubled the hard surface and more than doubled hangars. But putting this in the plan, when someone in the county is approached by a vendor they can see that this many hangars fit in the plan.

Pelfrey: The idea is to develop the airport.

MOP: disagrees.

MOP: If this did not contain the hangars, it would be harder for building to be put in?

M/H: not necessarily. We can build it without the drawing on there. It's up to the county if there's going to be additional hangars there.

M/H: the county still has to approve any development proposal. The county could only want hangars up to a certain size. It gets awkward if a facility can accommodate a certain class of aircraft and you don't have a spot for them. There's a non-discrimination clause about certain types of aircraft.

MOP: They can get them dirty outside.

M/H: There are gray areas with a runway and pavement strength that accommodates C-II but you can't house the C-II.

Defty: the county has mandated or given you directions to design a layout plan that is C-II and has all these hangars. This is the direction of the county.

M/H: There is not direct connection as to whether you call this a C-II airport and if there are C-II accommodating hangars. People have multiple aircraft and can fit many in there. We can accommodate an 80-foot wingspan.

MOP: Who owns them and who builds them?

Pelfrey: you have a ground lease and then you submit a building permit. Fire dept and other orgs look at that. It moves through a formal process.

Defty: they have 30-40 year leases on the ground.

MOP: Grant assurance. There are numerous large hangars used for things other than aircraft.

M/H: The FAA doesn't like to see non aviation uses on airport property. If an ALP shows an unusable portion, then you can use it for something else. This is a management issue.

Defty: This is not what M/H does.

MOP: I want to suggest to the WPAC that you record that the citizens of West Plainfield do not approve of this ALP and that if it passes via the BOS, we have filed an objection to these plans. We have filed a rejection to this.

Latta: does non-discrimination clause apply specifically to hangars?

M/H: if they physically can be accommodated here, it's difficult to keep them out. If it's B-II, we're not obligated to provide for C-II aircraft.

MOP: When do they ever consider the impact on the community?

M/H: There is an environmental impact document prepared by the county. There's a list of elements that must be looked at.

MOP: county practice can declare them not to be important and they can go without a review. This can be viewed as consistent with master plan.

M/H: county has committed to doing a negative declaration done by professional planner. There will be a comment period before then.

MOP: at what point do we need an aircraft control tower?

M/H: never.

MOP: Last overlay was funded by FAA grant funded in part by number of uses.

M/H: Overlay is to stabilize surface. They ask operations by weight classes. Operations count is from conversations. You get a best guess. In the past Caltrans had an acoustical way of measuring it. That was 15 years ago.

MOP: Want to see the drainage plan.

**Drainage:**

M/H: Study for size of basins and where they should go. This is what the engineers came up with. There is a canal and property line shown.

MOP: That's the irrigation canal, but in reality it continues.

Irvin: There is a canal that is higher than the irrigation canal. The ditch that everything drains into exists but it's not clear on the drawing.

MOP: it percolates after the holding ponds hold the water.

Latta: there are spillways that go from retention ponds to irrigation that services my property.

M/H: The simple answer is that this reflects the plan by the hydrologist.

MOP: is the airport graded to accommodate the water?

M/H: drains are located on the infield and have underground way of directing the flow into ponds.

Pelfry: They are existing drains.

MOP: what about hazardous wildlife attractants for piston vs turbine aircraft?

M/H: It will drain within 24 hours.



MOP(S): not it won't!

M/H: he's a professional and this is what he does for a living.

Pelfrey: is this unique or special design? And they said it was a standard way of dealing with the soil.

M/H: if someone feels they need to revisit something from another meeting, I can't do that.

MOP: How can they approve it with criteria for non wild life attractant? If it fails, are we in violation and the airport will shut down?

M/H: no.

Latta: Is there any assessment of water quality?

M/H: not in this plan. This was discussed at the meeting in January.

MOP: compliance requires that the culvert under the north end of the runway should be fixed as a safety issue. The irrigation canal on the north end needs to be fixed.

M/H: This is a 7-page ALP when it used to be 3 pages. There's a lot of additional details that didn't exist on sheets before.

Sheet 1— index

Sheet 2— main sheet. Overall big picture of airport. Future is shown here to be eligible for FAA funds. Road shift, fire station/Lillard hall, etc. Dates are shown with a revision history.

Sheet 3— data sheet. Minutia that FAA requires. Existing vs future columns. Wind, line of site, taxiways, etc. There are two new taxiways b/c of FAA change. Aprons to runways— accidental access to runway with active aircraft. Design makes that difficult. Recommendation: not allow aprons to directly access the runway. We remove and relocate the taxiway so it's not directly in line with apron. Distinct turns need to be made before the runway.

MOP: putting in 3 vs moving just one?

M/H: taxiways are from previous ALP.

MOP: what is the clearance between large hangars with tip of a C-II aircraft?

M/H: I don't know. I have to measure it.

MOP: autos are using the roads where they shouldn't.

Sheet 4— building area plan with legend.

Sheet 5— airspace surfaces. Plan and profile views. 3D version in lower left. We take survey info and put it in there to see obstructions.

MOP: Does this have any changes if this were being kept as a B-II airport?

M/H: No.

MOP: What road does this go up to?

MOP: 2 miles, so road 27.

M/H: 14,000 feet from end of runway.

Sheet 6— plan view and profile view of surfaces (approach and threshold)

Sheet 7— exhibit A airport property map. What parcels constitute the airport. It's very simple.

### **Internal discussion time**

Pelfrey: Move to continue to support the draft update and provide resources as requested. Second, all in favor.

MOP: The chair can't make a motion! What is the motion? What are you voting on?

Scribner: Move to continue to support the draft update and provide resources as requested.

MOP: now you need to undo your motion since it was approved.

Larsen: We didn't approve it.

MOP(s): yes you did! Just forget it!

MOP: Can you explain your motion? What do you mean by resources? Did you mean money?

Pelfrey: That's my motion.

Waxman: THE YCA PUBLIC INPUT WORKSHOP #2, DATED DEC 4, 2013 states:

"4. Is it true that the County wants to expand the airport to a category C-II Airport? No. The County has no plans to expand airport operations to a C-II classification. ... However, all development that has taken place in recent years and is anticipated in the future is consistent with the current B-II designation. For example, the designation for a C-II airport includes larger high performance aircraft with 49-79 foot wingspans, heavier takeoff weights, and faster takeoff and landing speeds. "

Since this is a B-II airport (as identified on page 3 of Mead and Hunt's ALP), the critical aircraft example is a Super King Air B200 with a max takeoff weight of 12,500 lbs. I would like to see growth at the rate of 1-3% (Attachment 1, Yolo County Airport Joint Fact Finding document dated Dec 4, 2013), while keeping aircraft within the description of a B-II airport. According to Mead & Hunt, this aircraft has a max takeoff weight of 12,500 lbs.

To be clear, I recommend airport improvements that support B-II with a 12,500 lb max takeoff weight only. Additionally, I recommend removing the future designation of C-II from page 3 of the ALP.

Items on the ALP that demonstrate C-II growth are: acquisition of land north/south of the airport, additional asphalt on the runways, hangars that accommodate C-II aircraft, moving the roadway on the south end of the runway, upgrading current 4 taxiways from B-II (30,000 lb) to C-II (75-85,000 lbs) and addition of 4 more taxiways that accommodate 75-85,000 lb aircraft. I recommend removal of these items from the ALP to remain consistent with recent past county documents and Fact Finding sheets that we have all reviewed within the past 18 months.

Latta: seconds.  
All in favor.

M.Defty: I move that the county draft an MOU that describes the intent of the airport as being a B-II airport. I realize that the future may change these plans, but the community would like a document. We've been told that we will only have a B-II airport, but the ALP shows differently. I want to see those two jive. I hear the county tell us that we just want more business at the airport. I'd like to see something like that as a document.

Waxman: second  
All in favor.

Latta: M/H continue to investigate relocation site of Fire station and Lillard with a community committee involved in the process to provide recommendations re: suitable location and needs of facility. Includes the fire chief and someone who works with Lillard hall.

Waxman: second

M/H: can you get a list to Mindi of who you would like us to contact?

Latta: yes.

All in favor.

Latta: maps and drainage plan. It's ambiguous because it's going in to the irrigation canal. I would like the maps to show the correct elements.

Defty: seconds.

All in favor.

Waxman: moves to adjourn.

10:11pm meeting adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Robyn Waxman.