

**Summary from Nut Tree Airport Public Meeting and Workshop
Airport Master Plan Update Study – Working Paper #3
December 8, 2010**

The fourth in a series of public meetings regarding the Nut Tree Airport Master Plan Study Update was held on December 8, 2010 from 6:30 p.m. until 9 p.m. at the Ulatis Community Center, 1000 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville. Approximately 75 people attended the workshop. The meeting consisted of a presentation by the technical consultants, Barnard Dunkelberg & Company, a roundtable workshop discussion between attendees who then reported on the table discussions, and a question and answer session at the end of the meeting.

The presentation can be reviewed, along with the Master Plan Working Paper #3, at the project website.

Reports from Roundtable Discussions

- * Is there another airport in the USA that is comparable? That has had a runway extension to 5,500 ft. with a non-precision approach, ILS, so we can compare the impacts?
- * Concern about noise
- * If the runway is extended, what zoning changes are required?
- * Need shopping area/airport connection for community connection and continue fly-ins
- * What is the safety record of turbojet aircraft?
- * A priority needs to be cooperation between agencies
- * Airport needs a business plan for economic development
- * Prefers Alternative #4
- * Priority is a concern about increased jet noise levels
- * Priority is attracting new business
- * Priority is taking care of clear zone changes
- * Priority is for keeping the airport a light sport-friendly airport
- * Needs summary of costs and challenges for each Alternative to really evaluate
- * Environmental issues, eucalyptus trees (non-native but need protection)
- * Concern about location of hangars
- * Concern about clear zone changes and negative impact on Solano College operations and future

expansion

- * Extend runway some, but why move it?
- * Thinks the instrument approach will have more impact than the runway extension
- * Most pilots using Nut Tree aren't qualified to use ILS. An uncontrolled airport with ILS is not a good idea
- * Safety for residents and pilots
- * Don't want it to become an international airport
- * Need to minimize effect of the Airport on neighbors
- * Priority of no increase in aircraft size
- * Priority of fixing any non standard conditions and review arrival and departure patterns
- * In option #4, if the aircraft parking is reduced, where will the aircraft go?
- * Priority is the environment – protecting the Eucalyptus trees, wildlife and creek
- * Priority is air traffic flow
- * In the FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions which are at the project website) please give the public the big picture regards to proposed Nut Tree Development plan
- * Priority is a summary of challenges and estimated costs and feasibility for each of the 5 alternatives
- * Need better understanding of the efficiency and safety of current and future corporate aircraft
- * Create a positive relationship with neighbors
- * Number and location of hangars is an issue
- * Prefers Alternative 2, or maybe #1
- * Public needs to continue to be involved
- * Supports airport as it is now
- * The priorities of Airport neighbors is most important
- * Why does the FAA require changes in the airport that has been in use since the 1950s (why is the fencing and other obstacles an issue now?)
- * Safety is a priority

- * Appreciates the opportunity with this meeting to comment
- * We make money selling fuel so we want at least some growth
- * Prefer a combination of Alternatives 4 (on the right side of runway drawing) & 5 (on the left side of that alternative drawing)
- * Corporate aircraft need airport/fuel facilities
- * Want a precision approach on the South end
- * Wants the runway widened
- * Concerned about noise impacts
- * Concerned about increasing pollution levels
- * Concerned about future expansion
- * No alternative is easy or cheap
- * Questions whether a longer runway will bring more jets?
- * Does not think an ILS is needed
- * Likes Alternative 2
- * Congestion (housing) around the Airport will limit growth and is not compatible – 20 years late on starting to contain growth
- * Wants fewer airplanes over Browns Valley
- * Slow growth of the Airport is best
- * Likes Alternative 5
- * Wants the canal moved
- * Wants land-use compatibility as top priority
- * Who would benefit from an airport improvement?
- * What will a precision approach do for Vacaville or the County financially?
- * What impact would Alternatives 3, 4, 5 have on the housing area to the north-east of Genentech?
- * If the Airport is improved, will more corporate aircraft buy fuel here, rent hangars here, bring more money into the community?

Other Questions and Comments

- * Concern about the eucalyptus trees being saved [*Response from Kevin O'Rourke, Interim General Services Director, was that a certain amount of the trees are designated to be cut, but he was not sure exactly which ones and how many. He indicated that the Airport staff, in the near future will post this information online, but with funding so tight, it may limit what will happen in the near term.*]
- * Desire to keep the Airport a recreational airport
- * Reiterated question about why the consultants are not considering moving the canal so runway would not need to be shifted [*Mark McFarland, technical consultant answered that the cost of moving the canal, which is elevated and which includes levees that surround the canal is a major infrastructure item and moving it is cost prohibitive*]
- * Question about whether the runway can have an "underrun", with shifting the runway 180 ft., is that removed or will it be an "underrun"? [*Mark McFarland, technical consultant, answered that the FAA has a set of guidance documents for runways including declared distance requirements for take offs etc. He indicated that while he does not think an underrun is likely in this situation, they will continue to look at all FAA options.*]
- * Commented that safety is first priority for everyone but that keeping the Airport alive and well with the Enterprise Fund is also critical.
- * Remark that participants are being asked to comment without a lot of critical information – such as cost and environmental impacts, which are needed to properly evaluate these options. [*Mark McFarland, technical consultant, acknowledged that some critical areas of information are needed to have a full understanding of what is involved with the alternatives. Providing that information is the next step in the process; however, it is important to get input on this range of alternatives to help narrow the options before the more detailed analysis is prepared.*]
- * Comment that the County and City need to capitalize on the airport, connect it to the shopping area, include school children through airport tours and have periodic fly-ins.
- * Requested that County continue to put effort into the pre-planning and opportunities to respond; people need to have a say and the County should be transparent
- * Where will the hangars be, how many and why? [*Mark McFarland, technical consultant, indicated that they are not at a point in the study to determine how many hangars could be considered. The need to narrow the options before fully evaluating the need for additional hangars*]
- * Need to find out all the airplanes in the area (through FAA records) and find out who would come to Nut Tree if the runway is extended 500 ft. or if a precision approach is put in for a healthier airport. It could bring in really good jobs.
- * Questioned whether the study of a runway extension is being considered solely for Copart?
- * Question from participant to Browns Valley residents asking if their CCRs included anything regarding the Airport or noise. [*A Browns Valley resident indicated that certain homes have an Avigation Easement but hers does not.*]

- * A question was asked about the deadline for comments on the Working Paper #3 – and the alternative concepts. *[It was confirmed that Monday January 10, 2011 is the deadline.]*
- * Appreciated the mailed notification and hopes that will continue *[The team indicated that if the project continues, there will be a direct mail to notify neighbors and businesses about the next meeting.]*

Other comments received on Comment Sheets:

- * Concerned that the County will pursue a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project
- * Suggested a land swap or purchase for surrounding areas that need to be acquired
- * Wants the trees saved and thinks that businesses should be attracted to increase revenue and enhance the connection to shopping areas
- * Think the Airport should remain a “hobby” airport
- * Concerned decisions have already been made
- * Enjoyed the roundtable discussion
- * Concerned that the negative impacts on residents were not highlighted
- * Wants the runway extension – there is a direct correlation between runway length and safety
- * Thinks the greater the takeoff distance permitted, the higher the aircraft will be over populated areas
- * Is aware of three (3) aircraft owners who have their multi-million dollar aircraft at other airports – Vacaville and the County are losing the tax revenue – rental cars, sales of jet fuel, rental of office space, employment
- * Supports Alternative #4

Next Steps

The technical consultants will continue to evaluate the alternatives, including input from the public meeting held December 8, and ultimately recommend a preferred alternative for further review and ultimately Solano County Board of Supervisors consideration. The last public meeting associated with the Master Plan Update will be held in the spring of 2011. Depending on the Alternative recommended to the Board and depending on their action, an environmental study would be undertaken before the recommended alternative would be approved.

Extensive publicity will take place before the next public meeting is held and it will also be announced online at the project website.

#