Contra Costa County
Aviation Advisory Committee
Meeting Agenda
550 Sally Ride Drive, Concord
Thursday, August 14, 2014, 10:00 a.m.

The Aviation Advisory Committee will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities who plan to attend its scheduled meetings. Call the Director of Airports Office at (844) 359-8687 at least 24 hours in advance.

Any disclosable public records related to this meeting are available for public inspection at the Director of Airports Office, 550 Sally Ride Drive, Concord, during normal business hours.

1. Roll Call
2. Opening Comments by Chair
3. Public Comment Period
4. Approval of Minutes (July 2014)
5. Consider Consent Items
   b. Relevant Board Actions
   c. Development Project Matrix (No Current or Ongoing Projects)
6. Presentations/Special Reports – None
7. Discussion/Action Items
   a. Items Pulled from Consent
   b. Airport Noise Report
   c. Byron General Plan Land Uses (Discussion/Update)
   d. Economic Development Working Group Update
   e. Buchanan Airport Sign (Discussion)
   f. Buchanan Field General Aviation Terminal (Discussion)
8. Updates and Announcements
   a. Airport Committee Update
   b. What is Happening at Buchanan Field & Byron Airports/Other Airports
   c. Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Update
   d. AAC Announcements
   e. Airport Staff Announcements
9. Future Agenda Items
10. Adjourn

Next AAC Meeting (Tentative): October 9, 2014 at 10:00 am at Byron Airport
Next Airport Committee Meeting (Tentative): September 11, 2014 at 10:30 am
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**ATTENDANCE ROSTER FOR 2014**

Aviation Advisory Committee
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
AVIATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
July 10, 2014

MEETING CALLED: Chair Mike Bruno called the meeting to order at 10:00 am at the Director of Airport’s Office.

PRESENT: Mike Bruno, Chair, CCC Airports Business Association
DeWitt Hodge, Member at Large
Keith McMahon, City of Concord
Rudi Raab, District I
Ronald Reagan, District III
Russell Roe, District V
Tom Weber, Vice Chair, District IV

ABSENT: Roger Bass, District II
Derek Mims, City of Pleasant Hill
Janet Kaiser, Diablo Valley College
Ed Young, Secretary, At-Large 1

STAFF: Beth Lee, Assistant Director of Airports
Natalie Olesen, Airport Office Assistant

OPENING COMMENTS BY CHAIR: None

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Duane Allen commented that the discussion of aerobatics should be discussed at Buchanan Field since some of the pilots may be based here. Mike Bruno responded that the current issues with aerobatics are coming from the Brentwood area. The AAC wants members of those communities to be able to attend; the AAC is also trying to find an aerobatic pilot who would be willing to attend the meeting.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS:


PRESENTATION/SPECIAL REPORTS – None

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. **Items Pulled from Consent - Noise Statistics**
   Russ Roe commented that at a previous meeting it was noted that noise complaints are increasing with the increase of operations.
   - It is important for pilots to remember to fly friendly as much as possible.
   - Community friendly flight paths and Noise Abatement Program need to be discussed.

   Item will be added to next agenda for discussion.

b. **Byron General Plan Uses**
   Beth Lee reported this was a follow-up from the last meeting. A list of current, proposed Buchanan Field uses and Minimum Standards uses were reviewed.
   - Goal is to make the uses comparable with those at Buchanan Field.
   - Make uses more general (rather than tied to a type) and process to be more flexible.
   - General Plan and zoning should be designed to be flexible to accommodate changes by the FAA that would cause the Minimum Standards to be updated.
   - Uses to support and facilitate a Foreign Trade Zone were discussed and added.
   - A memo will be sent to the Department of Conservation and Development that includes the additional items that were discussed; a copy of the memo will be provided at a future meeting.


c. **Economic Development Working Group Update**
   Beth Lee reported the first meeting will be held on Thursday, July 17 at 9:00 am.
   - Working towards a more creative incentive program to encourage existing tenants to stay and attract new pilots/businesses to move to the Airports.
   - The new program elements should be complete by the end of 2014.

d. **AAC Tenant Recognition Program Nominations**
   - Ronald Reagan nominated the Patriot Jet Team Foundation for their education outreach.
• Tom Weber felt the nomination information for Reach was not a strong enough to be supported this year. He also suggested nominating both emergency response companies in the following year.


UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. **Airport Committee Update**
   None – next meeting tentatively scheduled for September 11, 2014 at 10:30 am.

b. **What is happening at Buchanan Field & Byron Airports/Other Airports**
   Beth Lee reported that grant paperwork was being filed for the following:
   - Buchanan Field - Taxiway Echo repair and maintenance
   - Byron Airport – Pavement enhancements
   - Airport staff is looking at other projects which will be discussed with the AAC at a future meeting.

   Ronald Reagan reported the Patriot Jet Team Foundation is holding a fundraising auction and dinner.

c. **Update from Airport Business Association**
   None

d. **Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Update**
   Tom Weber reported the next meeting is scheduled for August
   
   Beth Lee announced Russ Roe was appointed to the ALUC

e. **AAC Announcements**
   - Next AAC Meeting - August 14, 2014
   - No September meeting
   - October Meeting will be held at Byron Airport

f. **Airport Staff Announcements**
   None

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

• Byron General Plan Amendment and zoning code – Update
• Noise friendly traffic patterns and Noise Abatement Program
• Airport Projects

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 11:19 am.
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
AVIATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING
June 12, 2014

MEETING CALLED: Chair Mike Bruno called the meeting to order at 10:03 am at the Director of Airport’s Office.

PRESENT: Roger Bass, District II
Mike Bruno, Chair, CCC Airports Business Association
DeWitt Hodge, Member at Large
Keith McMahon, City of Concord
Rudi Raab, District I
Ronald Reagan, District III
Russell Roe, District V
Tom Weber, Vice Chair, District IV
Ed Young, Secretary, At-Large 1

ABSENT: Derek Mims, City of Pleasant Hill
Janet Kaiser, Diablo Valley College

STAFF: Keith Freitas, Director of Airports
Beth Lee, Assistant Director of Airports

OPENING COMMENTS BY CHAIR: None

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Duane Allen thanked staff for the new Airport striping as it makes it easy to see at night and asked to have correction made to Draft Minutes (add the word “majority” for clarification as he had offered to pay for both hangars when considering changing hangars).


PRESENTATION/SPECIAL REPORTS – Byron General Plan Amendment (Patrick Roche, Department of Conservation and Development):

- Gave overview of why we are doing this, the process, environmental review and planning process.
- AAC first to preview to get initial comments and thoughts before going forward in the process.
- Funded by the Mariposa Community Benefit Fund
- The underlying land use is agricultural and not consistent with uses defined in the adopted Master Plan.
- Want to be more thorough and have land use designations that are consistent with Master Plan to support full build out.
- Change General Plan and zoning and get better guidance.
  - Impacts were noted but there was no discussion of the benefits or improvements to the community.
    - Patrick commented that the General Plan Amendment was to speak only to on airport land uses and not surrounding land uses.
      - Airport sits within the urban limit line; surrounding area is outside.
      - Dilemma is if you extend urban services (water, power, etc.) then you have to go over land not designated for urban use.
      - Very complicated issue and current focus is on the area within urban limit line.
      - It will need to go to the Board of Supervisors for final approval.
      - Must also conform to requirements of state zoning and environmental progress.
      - Uses identified would be permitted by right without needing additional planning permits and approvals.
      - Anything not specifically included would not be allowed without amending the zoning code.
  - It was questioned why the P1 designation does not get the Airport fully what it needs?
    - When the Airport was built the General Plan was not changed and that is necessary to implement the Master Plan.
    - Not every possibility can be anticipated and need to create the most flexible tool for the future non-aeronautical uses.
    - Concept is to use the FAA definition of aeronautical uses and have pivot points (like road network improvements).
  - Concern was expressed that we do not have an airport out there that can serve the broader, high growth community.
    - What is being proposed does not mention road connections necessary (like Vasco to Armstrong) which would help facilitate business growth.
    - Wants to set stage now in this process rather than waiting 10+ years for Route 239 process to be completed.
    - Brentwood’s GP was updated and calls for more commercial and industrial uses.
  - Comment was made that infrastructure (access, water and sewer) needs to be updated and need to make the development process attractive or it will not be viable.
Comment was made that the uses should be as broad as possible so they are the most flexible for the future.

- It should take approx. 6-8 mos. to complete and wants to get the environmental started. There will be two public meetings; the Planning Commission and then the Board of Supervisors for final approval. Input and comments are welcomed as he is not an aviation expert.

- Mike Bruno commented that, as a Buchanan Field business who would like to make changes, the timing and process is a problem. He also noted that the FAA advisory circular is more exclusionary rather than inclusionary and Airport Staff needs flexibility to properly grow the airports.

  - Russell Roe commented on timing issues: they have been talking about Armstrong Road extension since the airport was developed. Problem with waiting for Route 239 project completion is the improvements will be too late. They should include as much as possible in this process to create best canvas for future.

- Comment was made that there are many checks and balances in place to ensure compatibility. Problem with delaying inclusion of all compatible uses is that the added timing and cost will kill a future project. The process needs to be conscientious to avoid overburdening development; the more you put on a builder, the less likely the financial institutions will provide the funds necessary and the project will die. This process needs to be more flexible to allow for reasonable and competitive non-aviation uses in a less cumbersome and bureaucratic way.

  - Zoning code intrudes uses permitted by right without needing additional planning permits and approvals.
  - Keith Freitas responded we have it all now at Buchanan Field Airport; goal is to mirror that approach at the Byron Airport.

- There is a concern if you only look at this as an aviation zone, it should be viewed as an economic zone. There are tremendous opportunities that we may not be able to take advantage of and/or limit the ability to properly grow over time. The FAA does not lead; rather lags and we need a better way to provide future flexibility and allowable uses.

  - Keith McMahon commented that he works with a lot of developers and they focus on a business friendly environment and return on investment. We should look at creating an expanded list of allowable compatible non-aeronautical uses so that we have more growth options in the future. He mentioned the example of Portland Airport for broader economic focus; it made a huge difference for their growth.

- It is important to focus on the list of allowable uses to make sure all aviation and compatible, aviation-related uses are included in the zoning code.

  - Members all agreed that a restaurant, car parking and rental cars should be permitted.
  - Subject is to be on a future agenda to discuss expanding the list of allowable uses.

- A member of the public questioned whether what was in the original Board order, stated potential to look at changes (reduction) of land uses within urban limit line was still part of the project scope?

- Response was no it was not part of current scope and would be more appropriate when urban limit line is reexamined in 2016.
DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

a. **Items Pulled from Consent**
   None

b. **Set Meeting Calendar for June 2014 – May 2015**
   Mike Bruno suggested keeping meeting schedule the same. The September 2014 meeting conflicts with Airport Committee and will either need to be changed or cancelled. The Aviation Advisory Committee (AAC) agreed to keep the same schedule.

c. **Noise Issues**
   Keith Freitas stated there is good news and bad news. Aviation activity is increasing but that translates into more noise complaints.
   - Natalie Olesen commented:
     o There had been a couple of unusual events (Bart derailment in Concord and limb falling onto BART tracks in Concord) causing noise complaints from media helicopters.
     o 10 of the 30 noise complaints were from training operations off Runway 19R.
     o Increase in East County complaints due to aerobatics flying; they want this activity to go away (safety concerns with expanding residential uses).
   - Keith McMahon commented that the numbers are climbing but they are not large in total amounts (percentages are less useful as the actual numbers are so low).
     o Keith Freitas responded that while activity is much lower than in the past people do not remember the past higher activity. The community changes as does their life circumstances.
   - Mike Bruno commented education and public outreach may help to lessen some of the issues.
   - Aerobatics issue will be added to a future meeting agenda; when held at the Byron Airport.

d. **Economic Development Working Group Update**
   - Mike Bruno, Ronald Reagan and Russell Roe will represent the AAC
   - The process will start by inviting participation from larger tenants, hangar tenants and clubs to work with us to create an Economic Development Working Group
   - Airport staff is hoping to start the program in the next week or so.

e. **FAA Grant Projects**
   Airport Staff is looking at:
   - Buchanan Field Airport
     o Runway 14L/32R – $3.5 million for overlay and reconstruction
     o Taxiway Echo improvements sign and lighting upgrades - $1 million to $1.5 million
     o East Ramp pavement improvements - estimated at $1.3 million
       - FAA fundable but low priority, for FAA, so may be covered by Airport Enterprise fund.
• Byron Airport
  o Pavement rejuvenation of the airfield pavement (including sign and lights)
  o Runway extension – from 4,500 feet to up to 6,000 feet.
    ▪ There is some FAA support to extend the runway but need to show there is an existing need (not build it and they will come)

• Most project items solicit for a base project bid and included alternates depending on the funding.
• Ed Young questioned if Airport staff has explored having the Department of Forestry at Byron Airport
  o Jet A would be needed to set the stage to attract them.
• DeWitt Hodge questioned whether the extension of the primary runway would have any problems or concerns for the crosswind runway.
  o Extension of crosswind runway is anticipated but lower priority at this time.

• Staff will come back at a later date with a broader list of projects being contemplated.

f. Air Race Classic 2014
Buchanan Field Airport was selected as the starting point for the 38th Annual Air Race Classic.
• Race ends in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
• 46 planes and about 160 participants and involved parties.
• Full week of activity.

g. AAC Tenant Recognition Program Nominations
AAC received one (1) nomination but requested more
• Tom Weber suggested Patriot Jet Foundation for their education component; the nomination for Reach would need to be a lot stronger to support it.
• Ronald Reagan will recommend Patriot Jet Foundation for consideration.

This item was deferred to next meeting to give additional time to for submitting additional nominees.

 UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Airport Committee Update
None

b. What is happening at Buchanan Field & Byron Airports/Other Airports
• Sign improvements on freeway/roads and the on the west side of Buchanan Field Airport.
• Tenant BBQ was successful – about 320+ attended.

c. Update from Airport Business Association
Mike Bruno reported the economy is improving; businesses are still struggling but business climate is improving
d. **Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Update**
   
   There have been some member changes
   
   - David Durant is no longer on the ALUC
     
     - Replaced by Vice Mayor, Concord, Ron Leone
   
   - Officers have changed
   
   - At large position solicited
   
   - Airport representative has is going out for solicitation.

e. **AAC Announcements**
   
   None

f. **Airport Staff Announcements**
   
   None

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- Byron General Plan Amendment and zoning code – allowable land uses
- Aerobatic issues around Brentwood
- Reactivating Taxiway C for runway use.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 11:35 a.m.
### Noise Abatement Statistics

**June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Of Callers</th>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION OF COMPLAINTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Hill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Complaints</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLAINTS ASSOCIATED WITH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Field Airport</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Airport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement/Lifeguard Lights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-associated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME OF INCIDENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day (0700 - 1700)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening (1700 - 2200)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night (2200 - 0700)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF COMPLAINT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Flying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Low Flying</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Aircraft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF AIRCRAFT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propeller</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Types</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,578</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>48,691</td>
<td>41,083</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLAINTS PER 11,000 OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLAINTS PER 11,000 OPERATIONS - BUCHANAN ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feb - 2 complaints - Aerobatics over residential area
2 complaints - Pleasant Hill Residence off end of Runway near DVC
2 complaints - News Helicopters
Mar - 1 Complaint PG&E helicopter
Apr - 1 complaint - Aerobatics over residential area
2 complaints - from two individuals at same residence in Pacheco
May - 1 complaint News Helicopter
1 - complaint - training operations after 10:00 pm
## Contra Costa County Airports
### Monthly Operations Report

**June 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 2014</th>
<th>June 2013</th>
<th>YTD 2014</th>
<th>YTD 2013</th>
<th>% CHANGE 2013/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations</td>
<td>9,578</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>48,691</td>
<td>41,083</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operations</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>25,531</td>
<td>18,807</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itinerant Operations</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>18,099</td>
<td>17,328</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instrument Ops</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL FLOWAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 LL Octane</td>
<td>26,079</td>
<td>25,126</td>
<td>112,486</td>
<td>106,985</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Fuel</td>
<td>53,105</td>
<td>51,824</td>
<td>317,795</td>
<td>319,269</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79,184</td>
<td>76,950</td>
<td>430,281</td>
<td>426,254</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BYRON INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Fuel</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>18,351</td>
<td>19,148</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKYDIVERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Flights</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Jumps</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Jumps</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Jumps</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contra Costa County
Board of Supervisors
APPROVED Board Orders
Relating to County Airports

The following certified Board Orders are attached:

July 8, 2014
APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a month-to-month hangar rental agreement with Felix Boston for a shade-hangar at Buchanan Field Airport effective July 2, 2014, in the monthly amount of $172.41.

July 8, 2014
AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to submit an Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant application to both the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the California Department of Transportation-Division of Aeronautics (Caltrans) for approximately $892,500 and $22,400, respectively, to perform pavement maintenance on all the airfield, perform minor reconstruction on a portion of the ramp, and upgrade signage and lighting at Byron Airport.

July 8, 2014
AUTHORIZE the Public Works Director, or designee, to ADVERTISE the Byron Airport pavement maintenance, signage and lighting at Byron Airport. Project No. 4875-4650-SAS06C5314, DCD-CP#12-26, and FAA Project No. 3-06-0008-014.

July 29, 2014
APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Airports Director, or designee, to execute a month-to-month hangar rental agreement with 184 Flying Club for a shade hangar at Buchanan Field Airport, effective July 25, 2014 in the monthly amount of $172.41. (100% Airport Enterprise Fund)

July 29, 2014
APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Airports Director, or designee, to execute a hangar rental agreement for a T-hangar at Buchanan Field Airport with Knute Fisher, effective July 1, 2014 in the monthly amount of $383.74. (100% Airport Enterprise Fund)
To:     Board of Supervisors  
From: Keith Freitas, Airports Director  
Date: July 8, 2014  

Subject: APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a hangar rental agreement with Buchanan Field Airport Hangar tenant.

RECOMMENDATION(S):
APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a month-to-month hangar rental agreement with Felix Boston, for a shade hangar at Buchanan Field Airport effective July 2, 2014, in the monthly amount of $172.41, Pacheco area.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The Airport Enterprise Fund will realize $2,068.92 annually.

BACKGROUND:
On September 1, 1970, Buchanan Airport Hangar Company entered into a 30-year lease with Contra Costa County for the construction of seventy-five (75) hangars and eighteen (18) aircraft shelters at Buchanan Field Airport. Buchanan Airport Hangar Company was responsible for the maintenance and property management of the property during that 30-year period.

On September 1, 2000, the County obtained ownership of the aircraft hangars and shelters, pursuant to the terms of the above lease.

On February 13, 2007, Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors approved the new Large Hangar

☑ APPROVE
☑ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR
☐ OTHER
☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 07/08/2014 ☑ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYES 5    NOES ___
ABSENT ___    ABSTAIN ___
RECUSE ___

Contact: Beth Lee (844) 359-8687 By: Stacey M. Boyd, Deputy

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 8, 2014
David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

cc:
BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)
Lease Agreement for use with the larger East Ramp Hangars.

On February 3, 2008, Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors approved the amended T-Hangar Lease Agreement which removed the Aircraft Physical Damage Insurance requirement. The new amended T-hangar Lease Agreement will be used to enter into this aircraft rental agreement.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:
A negative action will cause a loss of revenue to the Airport Enterprise Fund.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:
Not Applicable

ATTACHMENTS
Hangar Rental Agreement
To: Board of Supervisors
From: Keith Freitas, Airports Director
Date: July 8, 2014
Subject: Acceptance of Federal Aviation Administration Grant Funding for Byron Airport Pavement, Signage and Lighting Enhancements

RECOMMENDATION(S):
AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to submit an Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant application to both the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the California Department of Transportation-Division of Aeronautics (Caltrans) for approximately $892,500 and $22,400, respectively, to perform pavement maintenance on all the airfield, perform minor reconstruction on a portion of the ramp, and upgrade signage and lighting at Byron Airport.

☐ APPROVE
☐ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR
☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 07/08/2014 ☑ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYES 5 NOES ___
ABSENT ___ ABSTAIN ___
RECUSE ___

Contact: Beth Lee (844) 359-8687

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 8, 2014

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: Stacey M. Boyd, Deputy
RECOMMENDATION(S): (CONT'D)

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Chair of the Board of Supervisors to sign a Statement of Acceptance with the Federal Aviation Administration for grant funds to perform environmental analysis, design, engineering and maintenance/reconstruction of various pavements at Byron Airport in the amount of approximately $893,000.

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to sign an acceptance of funds under the California Aid to Airports Program Grant Agreement-Federal AIP Matching Funds grant program to perform environmental analysis, design, engineering and maintenance/reconstruction of various pavements at Byron Airport in the amount of approximately $22,500.

FISCAL IMPACT:

On April 24, 2012, the Board authorized the submittal and acceptance of FAA and Caltrans grants for this project. The estimated project amount was approximately $600,000. Since that Board action, Airport staff has had our aviation engineer analyze the pavement and perform the design necessary to construct the required improvements. As a result of the design engineering, the project cost estimate has increased to approximately $992,000 but final project total cost may differ due to construction bids.

This Board action will authorize submitting and accepting FAA and Caltrans grants for the higher estimated project amount. There is no impact on the County General Fund. The total project amount will be approximately $992,000; of which about 90% (or $892,500.00) will be from the FAA, approximately 2.25% (or $22,400.00) will be from Caltrans, and about 7.75% (or $76,900.00) will be from the Airport Enterprise Fund.

BACKGROUND:

This FAA grant funding request is consistent with the Byron Airport Master Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 14, 2005. The adopted Airport Master Plan includes runway, taxiway and ramp maintenance activities plus signage and lighting enhancements. The pavement is about 18 years old and is in need of pavement repairs, upgrading to more energy efficient LED lighting and signage enhancements.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The County will not receive the FAA Grant funding necessary to maintain the airfield, perform minor reconstruction on portions of the ramp, and install signage and lighting improvements on the Airport.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable
To: Board of Supervisors
From: Keith Freitas, Airports Director
Date: July 8, 2014

Subject: Authorize the Public Works Director, or designee, to Advertise Byron Pavement, Signage and Lighting Enhancements

RECOMMENDATION(S):
AUTHORIZE the Public Works Director, or designee, to ADVERTISE the Byron Airport pavement maintenance, signage and lighting at Byron Airport. Project No. 4875-4650-SAS-6X5314, DCD-CP #12-26, and FAA Project No. 3-06-0008-014

FISCAL IMPACT:
The estimated construction cost is $992,000; of which, approximately 90% (or $892,500) will be from the FAA, approximately 2.25% (or $22,400) will be from Caltrans, and approximately 7.75% (or $76,900) will be from the Airport Enterprise Fund.

BACKGROUND:
The Contra Costa County Public Works Department is in the process of improving the pavement and upgrading lights and signs at the Byron Airport. The project will include the minor reconstruction and surface maintenance of the runways, taxiways and aircraft ramp. The project is necessary to maintain the structural integrity of the runways, taxiways and ramp as required by the FAA for safety, operational and capacity purposes. The project is consistent with the Byron Airport Master Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors

☐ APPROVE
☐ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR
☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 07/08/2014 ☑ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYS 5 NOES ___
ABSENT ___ ABSTAIN ___
RECUSE ___

Contact: Beth Lee, (925) 681-4203

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 8, 2014
David J. Twu, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: Stacey M. Boyd, Deputy

cc:
BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

on June 14, 2005.

The Department of Conservation and Development previously determined that this project is a Categorical Exemption, under Section 15302 (Class II) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Notice of Exemption (County file CP #12-26) was administratively approved on April 3, 2012. Even though a Categorical Exemption has already been determined, our department still requires that Board of Supervisors to authorize the Public Works Direction, or designee, to advertise the project for bids.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:
Delay in approving the project advertisement will result in a delay of the construction and may jeopardize Federal funding.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:
Not Applicable
To:   Board of Supervisors  
From:  Keith Freitas, Airports Director  
Date:  July 29, 2014  

Subject: APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a hangar rental agreement with Buchanan Field Airport Hangar tenant.

RECOMMENDATION(S):  
APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a month-to-month hangar rental agreement with 184 Flying Club, for a shade hangar at Buchanan Field Airport effective July 25, 2014, in the monthly amount of $172.41, Pacheco area.

FISCAL IMPACT:  
The Airport Enterprise Fund will realize $2,068.92 annually.

BACKGROUND:  
On September 1, 1970, Buchanan Airport Hangar Company entered into a 30-year lease with Contra Costa County for the construction of seventy-five (75) hangars and eighteen (18) aircraft shelters at Buchanan Field Airport. Buchanan Airport Hangar Company was responsible for the maintenance and property management of the property during that 30-year period.

On September 1, 2000, the County obtained ownership of the aircraft hangars and shelters, pursuant to the terms of the above lease.

On

☑ APPROVE
☑ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR
☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 07/29/2014 ☑ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYES   5   NOES   ____
ABSENT   ____   ABSTAIN   ____
RECUSE   ____

Contact: Beth Lee (925) 681-4203

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 29, 2014
David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: Stacey M. Boyd, Deputy
To: Board of Supervisors  
From: Keith Freitas, Airports Director  
Date: July 29, 2014  

Subject: APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a hangar rental agreement with Buchanan Field Airport Hangar tenant.

RECOMMENDATION(S): 
APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Director of Airports, or designee, to execute a hangar rental agreement for a T-hangar at Buchanan Field Airport with Knute Fisher, effective July 1, 2014 in the monthly amount of $383.74, Pacheco area.

FISCAL IMPACT: 
The Airport Enterprise Fund will realize $4,604.88 annually.

BACKGROUND: 
On July 1, 1984, Buchanan East Hangar Company entered into a 15-year lease with Contra Costa County for the construction of a row of four (4) aircraft hangars at Buchanan Field Airport. On October 11, 1989 the lease was amended extending the term to 20-years, ending on June 30, 2004. On October 1, 1996, a Second Amendment to Lease was approved extending the term of the least to 30 years, ending June 30, 2014. Buchanan East Hangar Company was responsible for the maintenance and property management of the property during that 30-year period.

On July 1, 2014, the County obtained ownership of the aircraft hangars, pursuant to the terms of the above

☐ APPROVE  ☐ OTHER

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR  ☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 07/29/2014  ☑ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED  ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYES 5  NOES 1  ABSENT 0  ABSTAIN 0  RECUSE 0

Contact: Beth Lee, (844) 359-8687  
By: Stacey M. Boyd, Deputy

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: July 29, 2014  
David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

cc:
BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

lease. Airport staff is now moving forward in executing a new hangar rental which will allow the existing tenant to remain a tenant with Contra Costa County as the landlord. The Board approved aircraft rental agreement form entitled “Contra Costa County Buchanan Field Airport T-Hangar and Shade Hangar Rental Agreement,” will be used to enter into this aircraft rental agreement.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:
This will cause a loss of revenue to the Airport Enterprise Fund.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:
Not Applicable

ATTACHMENTS
Hangar Rental Agreement
Chapter One

INVENTORY

The Buchanan Field Airport, Terminal and Administration Building Study is being undertaken in order to provide the Airport sponsor (Contra Costa County, California) with guidance for future development of a terminal building which will satisfy aviation demands now and into the future. The specific objectives of the study are:

- To inventory Airport physical facilities, air traffic operations, and socioeconomic data for use in generating forecasts of general aviation and potential commercial enplanement demand at the Airport;
- To research factors likely to affect air transportation demands in the local area over the next 20 years;
- To develop general aviation (including corporate) and commercial service demand forecasts;
- To provide recommendations on the size and location of the terminal and administration building;
- To provide information related to successful general aviation terminal and administration buildings at other airports, and
- To provide initial cost estimates and potential funding sources.

The format and structure of the study includes four specific elements which are briefly described as follows:
Chapter Two

AVIATION DEMAND FORECASTS

An important factor when planning the future needs of an airport involves a definition of aviation demand that may reasonably be expected to occur in both the near term (five years) and long term (20 years). For a general aviation airport such as Buchanan Field (CCR), forecasts of based aircraft and operations (takeoffs and landings) serve as the basis for facility planning.

Aviation activity can be affected by many influences on the local, regional, and national levels, making it virtually impossible to predict year-to-year fluctuations of activity over 20 years with any certainty. Therefore, it is important to remember that forecasts are to serve only as guidelines, and planning must remain flexible enough to respond to a range of unforeseen developments.

The following forecast analysis for Buchanan Field was produced following these basic guidelines. Existing forecasts are examined and compared against current and historical activity. The historical aviation activity is then examined, along with other factors and trends that can affect demand. The intent is to provide an updated set of aviation-demand projections for Buchanan Field and to utilize those factors which impact the need for terminal services to determine the size of an appropriate replacement terminal building.
Elements forecast in the previous chapter, such as commercial and general aviation operations as well as potential enplanements, will be utilized in the analysis of terminal and administrative building requirements. This section of the study will cover the following elements:

- General Aviation Terminal and Administration Building Size Requirements;
- Potential Locations for the Terminal Building;
- Review of other Successful General Aviation Terminal Building Projects;
- Cost Estimate for a new Facility; and
- Potential Funding Sources.

**TERMINAL BUILDING SIZE REQUIREMENTS**

There are several resources available for determining the appropriate size of a terminal building. Those consulted for this study include:

- FAA AC 150/5360-13, *Planning and Design for Airport Terminal Facilities*;
- ACRP Report 25: *Airport Passenger Terminal Planning and Design*;
- ACRP Project Number 07-04: *Spreadsheet Models for Terminal Planning & Design*;
- FAA AC 150/5300-13A, *Airport Design*; and
- *TSA Recommended Security Guidelines for Airport Planning*. 
SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATION

Buchanan Field is in need of a formal terminal building to serve existing users of the Airport and to potentially serve a commuter/commercial passenger function. The existing terminal building has outlasted its useful life, being nearly 30 years old.

This study provides recommendations regarding the size, location, and cost of developing a terminal and administration facility at the Airport. The minimum building size needed currently is 9,700 square feet. In the short term (next 5 years) a building size of 14,000 square feet is recommended. By the long term, a building size of 27,000 square feet is recommended. The short through long term estimates assume a combined facility that can accommodate general aviation, commercial, and administrative functions.

In addition, the Airport maintains a two ARFF vehicles and associated agents. A facility of approximately 4,000 square feet, which may be co-located with a terminal building, is recommended.

Four locations have been identified for a new terminal and administration building. The first option considered utilizing the site of the current terminal building. The second and third options are slightly to the south. All three of these options are on the east side of the Airport. The fourth option is located on the west side of the Airport in an area currently utilized for local aircraft tie-down positions.
Four examples of successful general aviation terminal buildings were presented along with the construction date, cost, funding sources, and available amenities. The example for Livermore Municipal Airport, which is currently under construction, is the most relevant in terms of cost due to its proximity to Buchanan Field. The 8,500 square foot Livermore terminal building is estimated to cost $5.9 million or $694 per square foot.

Most general aviation airports that construct terminal and administration buildings will primarily utilize local funding. Some funding may be available through AIP. Specifically, the Airport could put up to four years of non-primary entitlement funds ($600,000) toward a terminal project. As a reliever airport, they could also seek discretionary AIP funding of up to $200,000; however, a GA terminal building would rank low on the national priority ranking system.

LOCATION RECOMMENDATION

A variety of factors have been considered in evaluating an appropriate location for a replacement terminal and administrative building. These factors include: current land use, land control status, surface road access, expandability, available/potential vehicle parking. Table 3F presents a summary matrix of the major issues for each site considered.

Option 1, which is the location of the current terminal facility, is considered the first choice for a replacement terminal building. This location is centrally located to the runway and taxiway system which is desirable as taxi times and fuel burn are lower than if the terminal is located nearer the runway end. The site is the location of the current modular terminal structure; however, this structure should be removed and a new, permanent structure constructed. The land is owned and under the control of the Airport. The site is large enough to support phased construction of the terminal facility.

Vehicular road access is excellent. The location is at the end of the main Airport entrance road, John Glenn Dr. There is a parking lot in this location that has approximately 270 spaces. It should be noted that the parking lot is not owned by the Airport.

Option 2 is very comparable to Option 1 and would likely be considered the first choice if not for the fact the location is currently under lease. If the Airport were able to negotiate a relocation of the current FBO operations, this this would be an optimal location. One negative to consider is that an existing hangar, that currently generates revenue, would likely have to be removed.

The primary reason Option 3, was not chosen is because of the limited size of the parcel at the location. While an initial structure could be situated, after demolition of the existing hangar, future expansion would be limited by adjacent hangars and the road.
**TABLE 3F**
Terminal Building Location Matrix
Buchanan Field Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Location of the current terminal building.</td>
<td>Immediately south of current building.</td>
<td>East side between two GA conventional hangars.</td>
<td>Northside near conjunction of runways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use</strong></td>
<td>Rarely used, aged modular terminal building.</td>
<td>FBO leasehold and hangar.</td>
<td>FBO leasehold and conventional hangar.</td>
<td>Gravel aircraft tie down area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Road Access</strong></td>
<td>Excellent. At the end of main Airport entrance road, John Glenn Dr.</td>
<td>Excellent. At the end of main Airport entrance road, John Glenn Dr.</td>
<td>Excellent. Adjacent main Airport entrance road, John Glenn Dr.</td>
<td>Somewhat circuitous to get to the north side of the Airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Parking Status</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent parking lot with 270 spaces.</td>
<td>Adjacent parking lot with 270 spaces.</td>
<td>33 spots available currently.</td>
<td>None existing but undeveloped space available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Expandable</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited due to adjacent hangars.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>Air Ambulance operator would have to be relocat-ed.</td>
<td>Parcel under lease currently. Potential loss of revenue producing hangar.</td>
<td>Mixed in among busy GA businesses; Loss of revenue producing hangar.</td>
<td>Not easy for unfamiliar public to access the north side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Advantages</strong></td>
<td>Available parking; centrally located; Adjacent public viewing area; expandable, familiar location for airport users.</td>
<td>Available parking; centrally located; expandable, familiar location for airport users.</td>
<td>Location good for GA terminal exclusive functions but not for commercial function.</td>
<td>Available undeveloped land. Central location to the runway system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 4 is not considered further because of the confusing surface road route to access the site. There is not direct access to the north side of the airfield from the Interstate.

**CONCEPTUAL LAYOUT**

The management of the Airport has indicated that they desire to house three primary elements within a replacement terminal facility: General Aviation Services, ARFF, and Airport Administration. Exhibit 3G presents one possible layout for such a facility. In addition, if the Airport were to see a return to commercial passenger service, they would like the site and building to be able to accommodate expansion.

As can be seen on the exhibit, the ARFF portion of the building includes two vehicles to house the two primary vehicles. This could be expanded to three or more bays depending on need. Also included in the ARFF space is a command center which would have views of...
the airfield and all necessary communications equipment. An office room and storage space makes up the remaining portion of the ARFF functions.

A large public lobby is centrally located as a welcoming area for the building. A dedicated room is available for general aviation pilots to rest, eat, and do flight planning research. Several offices are located in proximity to the public lobby including an information/FBO customer service desk, a rental car counter, and restrooms.

Several offices are available to serve the Airport administration. This includes a print room and storage room. Restrooms are located in this portion of the building as well. When necessary, an additional wing could be added onto the building to accommodate commercial passenger service.

As shown in the exhibit, there is approximately 4,000 square feet dedicated to the ARFF functions and 14,000 square feet for general aviation and administration functions.