

Solano County Airport Land Use Commission



SOLANO COUNTY

Bill Seiden
Chairman

675 Texas Street, Suite 5500
Fairfield, CA 94533-6342
(707) 784-6765
Fax (707) 784-4805

www.solanocounty.com

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF MAY 7, 2015

The special meeting of the Solano County Airport Land Use Commission was held in the Solano County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers (1st floor), 675 Texas Street, Fairfield, CA 94533

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Potter, Baldwin, Cavanagh, Vancil, DuClair, Randall and Chairman Seiden

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Baumler

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Leland, Resource Management; Lee Axelrad, County Counsel; Kristine Letterman, Resource Management

Item Nos.

1, 2 & 3

Chairman Vancil called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Item No. 4. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as prepared.

Item No. 5. Approval of the Minutes

There were no minutes available for approval.

Item No. 6. Committee Reports

- Report from the ad hoc Nut Tree Zone B Committee

At the last regular meeting the commission considered two development proposals from the City of Vacaville. One of the issues raised was whether or not the requirement in the plan for 50% open space to be met in Zone B was being met. The commission appointed a committee to further examine the issue. Commissioners Seiden and Randall volunteered to sit on that committee.

Commissioner Seiden spoke briefly about the committee's findings. He noted that both he and Commissioner Randall made a visit out to the site to observe the areas where in the event of an emergency an aircraft could be put down either safely or without major injury to occupants. The committee's consensus was that the 50% has been met. Mr. Seiden indicated that the verbiage in the plan includes the opportunity to use such things as freeways if they are available and appropriately unobstructed. Commissioner Randall concurred with Commissioner Seiden reiterating that the project does meet the standard.

Mr. Leland noted that the City of Vacaville submitted a written letter agreeing to abide by the requirements as recommended by staff.

Item No. 7. Public Comment

There was no one from the public wishing to speak.

Item No. 8. Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

Item No. 9. New Business

A. Action Item: Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for the ensuing year.

Two separate motions were made and seconded to nominate Commissioners Seiden and DuClair as Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively. The motions passed unanimously.

B. Action Item: Conduct a Public Hearing to consider the consistency of ALUC-2015-07 (City of Suisun City Housing Element) with the Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plan. Sponsor: City of Suisun City

Jim Leland briefly reviewed staff's written report. The report stated that the City of Suisun City is proposing to adopt an updated Housing Element as a part of its General Plan. As required by the State Aeronautics Act, changes to a local agency general plan are required to be submitted to the ALUC for a consistency determination. The Draft Suisun City Housing Element has been submitted by the City and distributed to the ALUC for the mandated consistency determination. Staff recommended the commission determine the plan is consistent with the Travis Plan.

Since there were no questions or comments, Chairman Seiden opened the public hearing. There were no speakers either for or against this matter therefore the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Potter and seconded by Commissioner DuClair to determine the Suisun City Housing Element is consistent with the Travis Plan. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 15-09)

C. Action Item: Conduct a Public Hearing to consider the consistency of ALUC-2015-06 (Villages at Fairfield) with the Nut Tree Airport and the Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plans. Sponsor: City of Fairfield

Jim Leland introduced the item and provided the commission with an overview of the staff report. The City of Fairfield is in the process of reviewing amendments to the previously approved Villages at Fairfield Project. The Project consists of a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning which would reduce the number of residential units from 1,961 to 1,830. State law requires that any proposed general plan amendments or revisions and any rezoning actions be reviewed for consistency with adopted airport land use compatibility plans. Staff recommended that the commission determine that the project is consistent with the Travis LUCP.

Commissioner DuClair commented about current drought conditions and inquired if the applicant is going to proceed if adequate water is not available.

Mr. Leland explained that the city is doing their master planning for years' worth of construction and the rate at which they build out will be affected by whatever service availability exists at that time. He did not believe right now the city has a moratorium on new water connections.

Since there were no further questions, Chairman Seiden opened the public hearing. There was no one from the public wishing to speak therefore the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Commissioner DuClair and seconded by Commissioner Potter to determine that the Villages at Fairfield Project is consistent with the Travis Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 15-10)

D. Update: Receive a status report from the Chairman and staff on the update to the Travis Plan Update, and provide comments, including:

1. ESA Airports Progress Report
 - a. DRAFT Renewable Energy White Paper
 - b. DRAFT Policy White Paper
2. Technical Advisory Committee (Chair and Staff)
3. Renewable Energy Working Group (Chair and Staff)

Steve Alverson, ESA, provided the commission with an overview of the update process. His presentation covered the topics of work accomplished to date, the Travis LUCP policy changes, compatibility zones, noise contours, flight tracks, guidance changes, wildlife hazard zones, renewable energy facilities, and line-of-sight radar viewshed.

In response to Commissioner DuClair's inquiry, Mr. Alverson stated that as procedures and light tracks or noise contours change, it will be up to the commission to decide if the changes are significant enough to warrant an update to the Plan.

Commissioner Cavanagh said that he would have some reservations if staff is proposing to incorporate all or some of the ALUC policies and procedures into the Plan.

Mr. Alverson said that the proposal came in part at the recommendation of ALUC staff. He explained that currently the commission has various airport plans and separate review procedures that discuss how to apply those plans in different ways. The idea was to take the review procedures and incorporate them into the Travis Plan so that both documents are combined as one which would make it more user friendly, particularly to those who use the document on a daily basis.

Commissioner Cavanagh said that the idea makes some practical sense in terms of administering things, but he also thought the commission should carefully weigh that idea because if looking at including certain policies and procedures of the commission into the actual plan, it may be harder to change those policies. Mr. Cavanagh stated that the commission has a great deal of independence on how they administer policies and he would like to preserve that.

Mr. Leland said it is not staff's intention to make it more difficult for the commission to change policy. The fact of the matter is that the commission's review procedures would already need to go through a formal procedure to change. He said what is being proposed are the review procedures on how the ALUC reviews private development applications or how general plan consistency determinations are reviewed. He explained that it is prescribed first by the state and is embodied in a

document like the plan that the commission has adopted, and it would take a formal hearing process to change. Mr. Leland commented that the commission would most likely want different review procedures for the Travis Plan than for the Rio Vista or Nut Tree plans.

Mr. Leland explained for example that wind turbine developers would first approach the FAA for an obstruction evaluation and would obtain that evaluation because radar as an obstruction issue was not being considered at the time. The developer would then maintain that the FAA has jurisdiction and that their project has been cleared. Mr. Leland said that one review procedure staff has been considering is that the proponent would have to start with the ALUC for a wind turbine project. He said staff's only intent is that Travis deserves more robust review procedures than the Nut Tree or Rio Vista Airport.

Commissioner Vancil wanted to know if the updates to the Rio Vista and Nut Tree ALUCPs were to include their own review procedures, if the county's procedures would then go away. Mr. Leland said the intent is by the time all three plans are updated they will each have their own review procedures and the commission can then repeal the overall document.

Chairman Seiden spoke with regard to Figure 4 in the draft plan and pointed out the 500 foot line-of-sight. He mentioned that there was a lot of thought given to the idea of also publishing other heights so the possibility of lesser height turbines could be locked out and their impact to radar. He noted that this would change the map quite a bit. Also reference was made to wildlife as being a part of the consideration for airport land use compatibility plans and those conversations once again revealed that there is a bird survey that takes place every year by Travis. He said that being in a migration corridor is a risk factor and consequently one of the things that is called to attention in the 2011 Caltrans Plan is that wildlife needs to be considered because of air incidents around the country.

Chairman Seiden suggested that staff contact surrounding counties to talk about the radar issues and the county's intent in trying to prevent harm to the Travis mission.

Mr. Alverson stated that the idea currently is the commission could look at turbines that are 100 to 200 feet in height that may be allowed with a line-of-sight analysis, but not allowed within the Height Review Overlay zone. He said the possibility has been opened up for the lower turbines to be placed there but he believed the suggestion with regard to looking at the various viewsheds from 200+ feet is probably the best way to proceed.

Item No. 10. Adjournment

Since there was no further business the meeting was adjourned.