



Solano County  
**Airport Land Use Commission**  
675 Texas St., Suite 5500  
Fairfield, California 94533-6341  
www.solanocounty.com

Planning Services Division  
Phone: (707) 784-6765 / Fax: (707) 784-4805

Ray Schoch  
Chairman

## **SOLANO COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

### **MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF June 26, 2008**

The special meeting of the Solano County Airport Land Use Commission was held Thursday, June 26, 2008 in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas St., Fairfield, CA 94533.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Schoch, Commissioners Stockard, Potter, Baldwin, Foster, and Demos

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioners Cavanagh, Baumler and Seiden

OTHERS PRESENT: Lee Axelrad, County Counsel, Mike Yankovich, Resource Management, Jim Leland, Resource Management, Kristine Letterman, Resource Management, Harry Englebright, Englebright and Associates,

Items 1, 2 & 3: Chairman Schoch called the meeting to order at 4:16 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Item 4. Approval of the Minutes of April 10, 2008 and May 8, 2008  
The minutes of April 10, 2008 and May 8, 2008 were approved.

Item 5. Staff and Commission Member Comments and Items from the Floor  
There were no comments.

Item 6. Public Hearing to consider the consistency of the County of Solano General Plan Update with the Travis Air Force Base Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Nut Tree Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the Rio Vista Land Use Compatibility Plan. Applicant: County of Solano  
Jim Leland summarized issues relevant to the ALUC within the Solano County Draft General Plan Update. The state provides two tests for the ALUC to consider in determining if the Draft General Plan Update is consistent with the Nut Tree, Rio Vista and Travis AFB Land Use Compatibility Plans (LUCP). The first test is that there cannot be any direct conflict between the land uses of the General Plan and the compatibility plans of the airports. The second test requires that there is a process or mechanism to ensure that the compatibility criteria in the land use plans will be implemented and adhered

by the County. County staff has analyzed the Draft General Plan Update with the two tests in mind. Staff focused only on issues that were within the Travis AFB area of influence. (There were no changes to the Rio Vista and Nut Tree areas of influence.) The changes consisted primarily of establishing a Wind Energy Resource Area Overlay, a Travis Reserve Area Overlay and recognition of existing land uses that were not reflected properly on the current General Plan. The Wind Energy Resource Area Overlay is in a portion of the county that contains wind resources appropriate for the development of wind energy generation facilities. The Travis Reserve Area Overlay is an area where the County envisions protecting the area for future expansion of the Base or any subsequent user of the facilities of the Base. For both areas the existing agricultural uses could continue and expand. Mr. Leland stated that county staff concluded that the Draft General Plan meets the first test for consistency in that there are no direct conflicts with the Travis AFB LUCP.

The second test for consistency requires that there be an implementation process in the General Plan to ensure that land use development comply with the compatibility criteria set forth in the LUCP. A recent change to the Solano County Zoning Regulations requires that all development be consistent with the compatibility criteria of the Nut Tree, Rio Vista and Travis AFB LUCPs. The amendment to the zoning regulations satisfies the second test in that compatibility criteria will be enforced.

Mr. Leland stated that based on the above analysis county staff recommended that the Airport Land Use Commission find the Draft General Plan consistent with the Nut Tree, Rio Vista and Travis AFB LUCPs. There was one minor working change to make it clear in the General Plan land use policy that development must meet all the criteria in the LUCPs. Mr. Leland asked the Commission if there were any questions.

Commissioner Potter asked if the revised language would ensure that development would comply with airport compatibility policies. Mr. Leland answered that it would. Commissioner Foster stated that he thought that there were some direct conflicts that create inconsistencies. He thought that there were conflicts between the draft General Plan and the Travis LUCP. Long term land use compatibility between the Base and its environs is a community priority that needs to be ensured. He was not comfortable with a portion of the text describing uses for the Travis Reserve Area that read "...or *general aviation use*". Another area of the General Plan describing the Travis Reserve Area states that the area is designated "to accommodate future expansion of the Air Force Base and support facilities ... or general aviation use". A third section speaks of continuing to preserve land within the Travis Reserve Area to allow for Base expansion "*or other compatible future use*". Commissioner Foster thought that phrases used in the definition of the Travis Reserve such as "*or other compatible future use*" create a direct inconsistency with the Travis Land Use Plan. He asked what "other compatible future use" for the Base meant. He believed that the Travis Reserve Area should be used to protect Travis AFB only and not other compatible uses. He also stated it was

not clear whether the term “general aviation use” referred to small aircraft or commercial aircraft. He believed that either use would be a direct conflict with the Travis Land Use Plan.

Commissioner Potter stated that several studies had shown the potential for Travis AFB to become a combined use facility for commercial airlines and/or air freight. He asked if it was conceivable that the consultants working on the draft General Plan had that potential for the Base in mind when the additional statements regarding the overlay were added.

Mr. Leland stated that he couldn't speak for the General Plan consultants and would defer the question to them. He stated that from the point of view of county staff, while there is a background section to the Travis Plan, at the end of the day there is a land use compatibility map and a set of criteria that apply to those areas. In staff's judgment the existing Travis Plan does not support military only limitations on any uses that occur outside of Base property within the Cnel.

Chairman Schoch opened the public hearing for comments. Michael Yankovich stated that the “language referring to other uses addressed the idea that there could possibly be joint use of the Base in the future. It was the intent to address possible future uses of the Base”. Harry Englebright stated that there were a couple of issues relating to the Travis Reserve Area. The Reserve Area was established by LAFCo and incorporated into the City of Fairfield and Suisun City spheres of influence. The City of Fairfield adopted the Travis Protection Element as part of their General Plan. Mr. Englebright read from the Fairfield General Plan how it defined the Travis Reserve Area. It stated that land in the Travis Reserve is set aside for future expansion of the Travis AFB but if the status of the Base changes construction of a non-military airport and support uses may be permitted in the Travis Reserve Area. The Fairfield General Plan recognizes that in the future there might be an opportunity to expand current use or if the status of the Base changed the area could still be protected for airport uses. He stated that the County General Plan has the same intention towards the area as Fairfield's General Plan.

Commissioner Stockard stated that she objected to the term “general aviation”. She did not object to the language of the Fairfield General Plan because it did not talk about general aviation. Chairman Schoch commented that he could not conceive of the possibility of some general aviation use coming to the Base without the Airport Land Use Commission and other groups weighing in on its approval. He thought as long as the ALUC stated that it was compatible with the Travis LUCP he didn't think that there would be a problem.

Commissioner Foster stated that he wanted to challenge the statement made by Mr. Englebright. He stated that Mr. Englebright read the Fairfield definition and then compared it to be the same as the county draft General Plan. Mr.

Foster said that the draft General Plan is not the same as the Fairfield General Plan. The Fairfield plan states that “if the status of the Base changes...” Putting the phrase “or general aviation” in the definition of the Travis Reserve Area is a significant change and is saying that the status of the Base does not have to change before implementing other general aviation uses that may conflict with future expansion of Travis AFB. Commissioner Foster stated that he would concede consistency if the words “*or general aviation use*” were deleted. Commissioner Foster made a motion to find the General Plan consistent with the Travis Land Use Plan if the words “*or general aviation use*” were deleted and subject to the addition of a statement shown in the staff report that stated any development projects will go through the ALUC review process. Commissioner Demos seconded the motion. Mr. Axelrad noted that they were still in the middle of the public hearing, if the motion was for a straw poll they could continue but if the motion was to conclude the Commissions deliberations and take a final vote then the Chair should conclude the public hearing. Commissioner Foster stated that he would amend his motion to be a straw poll. Chairman Schoch stated that he was ready to close the public hearing portion and asked if any of the Commissioners had any further questions. There being no further questions Chairman Schoch closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Foster restated his motion to find the General Plan consistent (as stated in the staff report) with the Travis Land Use Plan subject to the addition of the statement shown in the staff report that any development projects will go through the ALUC review process, the deletion of the words “*or general aviation use*”, and to adopt ALUC Resolution No. 08-(as handed out) as amended by the Commission. Commissioner Demos seconded the motion. Commissioner Stockard asked if the words “*or general aviation use*” were eliminated would it also eliminate any possible change from the Base to continue as an aviation area should the Base move. The answer was no. Chairman Schoch reopened the public hearing. Mike Yankovich stated that if one policy contains language regarding a non-military use and references to general aviation use were deleted from the other three policies an internal inconsistency would be created within the General Plan. State law requires that all chapters in the General Plan be consistent with one another. He suggested that they use internally consistent language in all four of the policies. There being no further questions Chairman Schoch closed the public hearing.

A roll call vote was taken on the standing motion and second.

	Yes	No	Abstain
Commissioner Stockard			X
Commissioner Potter		X	
Commissioner Baldwin			X
Commissioner Foster	X		
Commissioner Demos	X		

Chairman Schoch		X	
-----------------	--	---	--

The motion did not pass.

Commissioner Foster stated that he would like to make another motion. He motioned to accept the Resolution as presented by staff with the deletion of the words “*or general aviation use*” and add language to the effect that if the status of the Base changes then construction of non military airports and support uses may be allowed. Commissioner Stockard seconded the motion. Commissioner Potter asked if the motion was consistent with the staff recommendation for an alternative. Mr. Yankovich answered that is was consistent. A roll call vote was taken.

	Yes	No	Abstain
Commissioner Stockard	X		
Commissioner Potter	X		
Commissioner Baldwin	X		
Commissioner Foster	X		
Commissioner Demos	X		
Chairman Schoch	X		

The motion passed unanimously.

Item 7. Discussion and Possible Adoption of Final ALUC By-Law Amendments.

Chairman Schoch noted that the ALUC by-laws had been discussed at previous meetings and asked if there was a motion to adopt the final ALUC by-law amendments. Commissioner Foster made a motion to accept the ALUC by-law amendments and adopt the resolution to adopt the by-laws. Commissioner Demos seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken.

	Yes	No	Abstain
Commissioner Stockard	X		
Commissioner Potter	X		
Commissioner Baldwin	X		
Commissioner Foster	X		
Commissioner Demos	X		
Chairman Schoch	X		

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Schoch asked if there were any other Commissioner comments before the meeting was adjourned. Commissioner Potter thanked staff for their written assessment of the General Plan Impacts as presented to the ALUC. Mr. Foster asked to see a copy of the 2008 ALUC work plan. Mr. Axelrad added that a copy of the recent Muzzy Ranch decision by the state court of appeals was included in the meeting materials. The court of appeals determined that the Airport Land Use Commission won the case.

Item 8. Adjournment

The next regular meeting of the Solano County Airport Land Use Commission will be held on **Thursday, July 10, 2008**, in the Solano County Administration Center, Multi-Purpose Room, 675 Texas St., Fairfield, CA 94533