



TRUCKEE TAHOE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

RICHARD ANDERSON – Nevada County Board of Supervisors (2015/16 Chairman)
 BRENT P. COLLINSON – Placer County Airport Managers
 CAROLYN WALLACE DEE – Nevada County City Selection Committee
 KEN FOSTER – General Public (2015/16 Vice Chairman)
 JENNIFER MONTGOMERY – Placer County Board of Supervisors
 BRIDGET POWERS – Placer County City Selection Committee
 KEVIN SMITH – Nevada County Airport Managers

DANIEL B. LANDON, Executive Director
 Nevada County Transportation Commission
 Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission

MINUTES OF MEETING October 27, 2016

A meeting of the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission (TTALUC) was held on Thursday, October 27, 2016 in the Truckee Tahoe Airport Meeting Room A, 10356 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, California. The meeting was scheduled for 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Richard Anderson, Brent Collinson, Carolyn Wallace Dee, Ken Foster, Jennifer Montgomery*, Bridget Powers, and Kevin Smith

Staff Present: Daniel Landon, Executive Director; Toni Perry, Administrative Assistant

Standing Orders: Chairman Anderson convened the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission meeting at 10:07 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

Chairman Anderson announced the Commission would postpone Item #1, the scheduled Public Hearing, until the audio visual issues were resolved and the computer and projector were in working order.

2. TTALUC Minutes

May 6, 2016 TTALUC Meeting Minutes. *Approved.*

There was no discussion on the Minutes. Commissioner Dee made a motion to approve the TTALUC Minutes of May 6, 2016. Commissioner Collinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Anderson, Collinson, Dee, Foster, Powers, and Smith. Commissioner Montgomery had not arrived at the meeting as yet, due to a conflicting meeting time.

3. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Landon reported on the projects that staff reviewed and approved since the previous meeting of May 6, 2016. He said all of the projects were very straight forward and there

was no controversy or issues that needed to be reviewed by the TTALUC. He asked the Commission if they had any questions. There was no discussion.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Anderson asked if there were any Commission Announcements, since the audio visual equipment was not fully functional yet.

Commissioner Smith said the Airport Board of Directors met the previous evening and the airport is updating a set of four primary management and compliance documents, including "Rules and Regulations" that dictates behavior for anyone that comes on the airport. The second document is called "Minimum Standards", which regulates commercial activity on the airport. He said there is "Rates, Fees and Charges" that regulates how the airport charges for things and how they separate fees and charges. Commissioner Smith stated the fourth document is "Basic Development Standards" for how you build on the airport. He said it is a pretty complex project they have been working on for eighteen months that is wrapping up. It is based on current and existing policies that the Airport District calls "Policy Instructions". He said they have a whole set of Policy Instructions, but the FAA does not know what a Policy Instruction is. The airport sends them their Policy Instructions and the FAA asks for their Minimum Standards and their Rules and Regulations, which is what the industry calls those. Commissioner Smith reported they have gone through the process of having them updated, and there are edits that were made. They will go back to the Airport District Board on November 30, or it could go into January. He said there is nothing substantially different in these documents than how the airport has been operating for the past 50 years; even Development Standards do not supersede any town or county requirements; it sets basic guidelines for the things that are talked about in the standards.

Commissioner Smith said they had some discussion the previous evening about noise annoyances and some of the impacts from a very busy summer in the community; the airport, the road system, the campgrounds, and resorts were all very busy. He said there was more talk of how the airport can be more. They are going to do a spring camp with airport staff, and maybe the community, to talk about how to get through the July to September peak season cycle. He said one-third of all the operations occur in about a 2 ½ month period; about half the operations at the airport take place in a 4 month period during the summer. He said there are days like the current one where they may have 20 operations for the entire day. Commissioner Smith said the airport is trying to figure out how to adapt to the growth the entire region is experiencing. He said the airport has seen a 50% jump in operations per year over the past 2 years. When he started at the airport in 2010 there were about 19,000 operations and they have increased to 31,000 operations in a six year period. He said their operation count tracks very closely with the NASDAQ and the Dow; particularly the jet operations and turbo prop operations that go up and down with the market. When the market drops off then the aircraft operations also drop off. Commissioner Smith said the piston aircraft is static; it is not going up or down. He said the turbo props are their number one operating aircraft by far, and at the expense of some of the jets that are not coming in; they are flying the PC 12s.

Commissioner Dee asked Commissioner Smith if he has looked at any figures comparing peak status periods with some of the Town business figures. Commissioner Smith said yes. Commissioner Dee said it would be interesting if he sat down with Tony Lashbrook, Truckee Town Manager, to see how those overlap. Commissioner Smith said it shows just driving around town when it has been a very busy day at the airport; it is the cyclical nature of living in a resort community. He said the aircraft behave very similar to the tourists that come to visit. He said lodging, even the flows through the treatment plant, all follow the cycles that the airport experiences. It is no different than all the other transportation services. Commissioner Dee said not

just the summer, but all the way up to about two weeks previously, it has been wild. She said this summer has broken all records with sales tax, and TOT (Transient Occupancy Tax) is beyond anything they would even budget for and they are constantly adjusting. Commissioner Smith said the airport's jet fuel sales were way beyond what they budgeted for.

Commissioner Foster asked Commissioner Smith if he understood him to say the PC 12 is the most common aircraft at the airport. Commissioner Smith responded by far. He said the airport had 11,000 jet and turbo prop operations; of those 11,000 operations 3,000 were PC 12s. He said that does not count all the other aircraft; and 182s were a different subset. Commissioner Collinson said PC 12, 172, 182, and SR 22 are the biggest piston operators. Commissioner Smith said that was the 2015 count, since they are still working on the 2016 count. He said it looks like that trend is continuing. In 2015 there were 50 fewer jets than in 2014; but he did not think that trend was continuing in 2016. Commissioner Smith said they had 1,700 more turbo prop operations. Commissioner Foster thought that statistic had to be counted physically by a human being. Commissioner Smith responded it is all automated with flight tracking and the eleven camera system. He said it takes a picture of the "N" number and then it pulls the data out of the national data base that lists exactly who owns the aircraft and what type of aircraft it is. He said because of where the cameras are positioned, it knows the arrivals and departures and will match those up, within a certain period of time. He said that is how they count operations; when they arrive that is one operation and when they depart that is another operation.

1. PUBLIC HEARING – Adoption of the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (TTALUCP), Including Airport Influence Area, and CEQA Negative Declaration

Chairman Anderson directed the meeting back to Item #1 on the agenda at 10:18 a.m. Executive Director Landon noted that during the 30 day comment period for the TTALUCP update staff was surprised by the lack of comment. He said no state agencies were heard from. The information was provided to the Town of Truckee, Placer County, and Nevada County, and TTALUC staff offered to make presentations to those agencies, but received no comments or requests to speak. He said everything was in readiness and he knew of no controversy. Mr. Landon introduced Maranda Thompson, Senior Planner from Mead & Hunt, Inc., who gave a presentation.

Maranda Thompson said her presentation, as a part of the Public Hearing, would also serve as a Public Workshop. She gave a brief background and noted the Public Utilities Code requires, with limited exception, an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) in each county in California. The primary purpose or function of the ALUC is to protect public health, safety, and welfare by insuring an orderly development of airport expansion, as well as adopting land use measures that would be implemented at the local level to safeguard the public and address safety and noise hazards. She noted an ALUC does this by adopting an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). Ms. Thompson said an ALUC also has the authority to review certain local documents such as General Plan Amendments, zoning changes, as well as any airport development plan. She said earlier in the year the TTALUC reviewed the Truckee Tahoe Airport Master Plan, which was recently updated.

Ms. Thompson said the ALUC has no authority over the airport operations, which means you cannot dictate that an airport remove a certain proposal for expansion from its Master Plan or Airport Land Use Plan. The ALUC has no authority to dictate where or how aircraft are flying in and out of an airport. It also has no authority over existing land use, which means if there is a type of use that is incompatible with airport operations, the ALUC cannot go in and force a change to that particular land use. She said an ALUC has no authority over federal, state, and tribal lands, so if there are forest lands nearby and the government wants to put a development in there, the ALUC has no authority over that development. Ms. Thompson said an ALUC could comment on it, like

any other agency, but you would have no additional enforcement in that regard. She said an ALUC has no direct ability to implement the land use measures that they adopt; that is handled by the local jurisdictions. She said within the ALUC statutes what you do is adopt the land use measures and there is another requirement in state law for the local jurisdictions to amend their General Plans to be consistent with the ALUCP, or to take action to overrule the ALUC's plans.

Ms. Thompson said, in terms of developing an ALUCP, the statute specifies certain requirements, one of which is that the plan covers at least a 20 year time horizon. She stated that typically comes into play when you are looking at noise contours, to determine if it is addressing potential noise impacts for the next 20 years. It also must be guided by the California ALUCP Planning Handbook that is published by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics. There is a lot of information in how to address noise and safety and the California Handbook goes so far as to give you criteria in terms of the intensity of certain ranges within specific areas around an airport. She said it also must address four compatibility factors: 1) noise that deals with disruption to human activities such as sleeping, learning, and holding a conversation with someone; 2) overflight, which deals typically in areas under primary flight patterns, deals with single event noise issues, and it is primarily an annoyance that is very subjective, so the handbook provides some guidance to ALUC's in terms of how to deal with potential noise due to overflights; 3) safety regarding the public, in terms of a potential for an aircraft accident that would be an impact to the community if a crash were to occur and to safeguard against those occurrences; 4) airspace protection that deals with protection of pilots that fly in public.

Ms. Thompson said the airport is bisected by Nevada and Placer Counties, so the TTALUC is a special ALUC to deal with land use matters that affect both counties. She said the Nevada County Transportation Commission staff serves as the TTALUC staff and for the Nevada County ALUC. She said the TTALUCP was originally adopted in 2004 and when the current TTALUC was established in 2010 the TTALUCP was readopted with some minor changes that included references to the new TTALUC instead of the former Foothill ALUC. Ms. Thompson reported that the impetus for the update of the TTALUCP was initiated by the recent update of the Truckee Tahoe Airport Master Plan by the Truckee Tahoe Airport District. She noted that some of the major changes in the 2025 Airport Master Plan is that it removes two future parallel runways from the future scenario for the airport and that triggered the zones to narrow because of the elimination of those two runways. Ms. Thompson said it includes a proposal to lengthen the crosswind runway and upgrade it to a higher category, so some of the traffic on the primary runway could then use the crosswind runway. She said there is also a lower aircraft activity level that is reflected in the new Master Plan and also reflected in the updated TTALUCP, but the overall effect of those Master Plan changes have very little effect on the Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary for the Truckee Tahoe Airport in terms of the TTALUCP. Ms. Thompson showed a map that compares the old and new AIA boundaries. She said because of the extension to the crosswind runway and the upgrade, it pushes the envelope a little further south into Placer County, covering portions of the Lahoten neighborhood and North Star communities. She said that is the principal change to the AIA. That is significant because one of the duties for an ALUC is to establish AIA boundaries and when doing so you need to coordinate with the affected local jurisdictions, which in this case is Nevada County and Placer County and the Town of Truckee. She said that was why it was important for Executive Director Landon to offer those agencies the opportunity to discuss the TTALUCP at their boards and city council.

Ms. Thompson said there are Zones A through E and the zones deal with all four compatibility factors in a composite manner, so one set of zones deals with noise, safety, overflight, and airspace protection. She said because they eliminated the parallel runways there was a shrinking of the zones lateral to the runway, and because of the extension of the crosswind runway it pushes out the

zones that now extend north and south. She said most of the zones stayed intact. Chairman Anderson said, regarding the crosswind runway, that the northern end has Compatibility Zone C extending off of it, but the southern end does not; he asked why. Ms. Thompson responded because of the terrain in that area and the amount of overflights over that particular community, so it encompasses the generic safety zones that are provided in the handbook. She said because all four compatibility factors are addressed, it looks slightly different from what is in the handbook. She said the reason why Zone C does not extend in that direction is because terrain limits how aircraft traffic operates in and out of the airport. She said at the north end there is a straight-in instrument approach, so they are providing a protection along the approach corridor. Chairman Anderson asked if someone could fly in from the north side and then leave from the south side. Commissioner Smith responded that Runway 11 and Runway 20 are the two runways that have instrument approaches that bring aircraft in from that direction. He said one of the reasons those zones did not necessarily shrink, even with the runways being removed, was because of the design of the approach procedures. He said Zone C has a noise abatement procedure that they ask pilots to fly that protects that area also.

Ms. Thompson said Zone D captures a traffic pattern area, and then along the approach corridors you see Zones C and B1. She said Zone B1 is obviously a more restrictive zone and off the northwest it is much larger because of how some traffic is heading northeast and the other is turning down or towards the west over Donner Lake, so you see that span in B1. She said Zone C is a buffer to B1, and because of that instrument approach, the approach on Runway 20 is extended to the southwest end.

Commissioner Collinson asked about the west end of Zone D where there is a little triangle on the map and he asked why. Chairman Anderson said he thought it was either the hospital or the sheriff's office. Ms. Thompson recalled that was done as part of the 2004 effort and she believed there was some attention paid to the land use that exists there and instead of doing a site exception they just carved out a notch to that area in Zone D.

Commissioner Foster said the whole canting of Zone D, as you are departing off of Runway 29 to the north, that canting to the north is all because of the recommended flight path. He said it is either the recommended departure or the instrument departure. Ms. Thompson said a lot of people are headed towards a way point known as the "truck intersection" and that is why Zone D has expanded; because of the higher terrain, people are more sensitive to overflight and single event noise. She said that is why Zone D is much larger off to the northwest.

*Commissioner Montgomery arrived at the meeting at 10:33 a.m.

Ms. Thompson said in terms of some "Policy Changes", because NCTC is staff for the Truckee Tahoe ALUC and the Nevada County ALUC, they organized the policies of the TTALUCP to more closely match the Nevada County ALUCP that was adopted in 2010. This would help to streamline staff's review of development proposals because it looks and feels the same between the two plans. She said the zones changed due to the Airport Master Plan proposals and they also have clarified or expanded certain policies that are in the current plan, based on their experience of working with other airport land use commissions and where they find a lot of questions and interest in getting more detail. Ms. Thompson said they specified the types of airport plans that are required for ALUC review. For example, any airport expansion plans that would be captured or reflected in an airport master plan is obviously required for ALUC review. But some questions that often come up regarding non-aviation development of airport property is if that is subject to ALUC review, and it is. She said that was clarified in the recent ALUCP update. They also established the effective

dates and they reference it up front, so when an ALUC adopts a plan, the local jurisdictions know the plan that is in effect. That allows them easy reference as well.

Ms. Thompson said, in terms of environmental documents, CEQA requires a development proposal within 2 miles of a public airport to reference the guidance and the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook that is published by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics. They are also requiring that the ALUCP be a reference tool in any proposal around an Airport Influence Area. She said charter schools are required to submit their development plans to the ALUC and that was specified in the TTALUCP update. They modified some of the language to define existing land uses to more closely match what was done for Nevada County and what tends to be a good model for many ALUCs. Ms. Thompson said they also specified any ALUC review fees be submitted along with the application. They stated when an application comes to the ALUC they have 60 days to make a decision, otherwise it is automatically considered consistent with the ALUCP. The update clarified an appeal process for any ALUC staff decisions. She said staff will review a proposal and if they find it is clearly consistent with the ALUCP, it does not have to go before the Commission; rather the Executive Director will provide a report of all the actions and determinations that he has reviewed for development proposals. She said if someone were to have strong feelings against a particular project they can ask that the ALUC have a chance to review the proposal; there is now a policy in place to allow for that process.

Ms. Thompson reported there is also a policy that addresses single noise events, which recognizes that some projects are extremely noise sensitive. She said, although they look to the CNEL noise contours for the airport to determine whether or not a use is compatible with airport operations, there may be certain situations where they need to require as a condition of approval some noise monitoring of the site to insure that future uses will not be impacted by the overflight of aircraft. There is also a lot of information on "how" to calculate intensity of nonresidential development. She said this has evolved over the years, based on input from other ALUC staff wanting to figure out how to review a mixed use development, so they specified steps to be taken to assess whether or not it satisfies intensity criteria. Ms. Thompson reported the way ALUCs consider intensity is to look at the number of people per acre, which is not a metric that is often used in the local land use levels. She said they have to provide additional clarification of how to perhaps use floor area ratios, which is a common practice in determining intensities. She said that is discussed in the policy of how to evaluate mixed use development, especially if there is commercial on the lower floor and residential on the top floor. When a project site may have residential on one portion of it, they discussed how that affects the total number of people on the property.

Ms. Thompson reported they also specified a policy that talks about potential for reusing a building for a different purpose. She said although you may be approving an industrial warehouse, there could be a new use that comes into it, such as a play house for children, that would be incompatible, but they are using a building that the ALUC deems compatible. She told the TTALUC to always think about that when they are reviewing development proposals. She said sometimes an ALUC will include a condition as part of the conditional use permit, for example, that states the future use of the building must still satisfy the intensity requirements of the ALUCP. Ms. Thompson said they also revised the Site Specific Exception for the Truckee Railyard Redevelopment Area consistent with the determination of the approval by the TTALUC early in spring 2016.

Ms. Thompson stated those were the overall Policy Changes. She said one more change was relaxing the single acre intensity criteria, which they did to be consistent with the new guidance published by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics in 2011. She said the state found there are certain types of land uses that are considered typically compatible with airport operations and, although they met the average acre intensity numbers, they could never satisfy the single acre intensity limits.

She stated they put together a technical working group to figure out what would be the appropriate single acre limit. She said when they look at the entire site they are looking at the total number of people that could be on the site, but within a single acre of that property you do not want to have too many people on one single acre, because if there was an aircraft accident, you are exposing that group of people to potential risk. She said that is why ALUCs establish the average and single acre intensity limits.

Ms. Thompson said, in terms of CEQA, the purpose is to inform decision makers, such as the TTALUC and the public, about potential environmental impacts from the proposed project. She said the TTALUCP is regulatory and is only a policy document; there is no moving of dirt. They did a General Plan consistency evaluation and found that there were minor conflicts, primarily with referencing to the former Foothill Airport Land Use Commission body. She thought all three jurisdictions have an overlay zone that physically implements the TTALUCP, so minor tweaks would be needed to reflect the new airport influence area and zone boundaries. Ms. Thompson said very minor changes will be required that specifies those inconsistencies in the initial study. There was a finding of no significant impact and that went through the public review period, which is 30 days, from September 1 through October 3, 2016. She said it was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, and to the three affected local jurisdictions. No recommended comments or changes were received for the TTALUCP or CEQA document. She offered to answer questions of the Commission.

Commissioner Dee asked when the needed “minor tweaks” to the General Plans were required to be done. Ms. Thompson said once the TTALUC adopts the Compatibility Plan it triggers a 180 day state statute requirement for the local jurisdictions to amend their plans. She said that has never really been enforced; usually the ALUC just wants to know that the local jurisdictions are taking steps to amend their plans, because they too have to go through an environmental process and public process, which can take some time. She said, usually, as long as a local agency is making the effort to move forward with the changes, it is sufficient for many ALUCs. Commissioner Dee said some jurisdictions are facing General Plan updates, but their timeline does not necessarily fit that deadline. It shows that they are going forward with the efforts to change their General Plan.

Commissioner Dee said earlier in the presentation Ms. Thompson stated that part of the need for the updated changes were triggered by an anticipated lower aircraft activity, but Commissioner Smith’s comments at the beginning of the meeting gave a different picture. Ms. Thompson said the 2000 Airport Master Plan reflected aggressive growth because future activity was based on expansion to four runways. She said, not looking at existing levels, the forecast activity level is lower than what the 2000 Master Plan anticipated. Commissioner Smith said the airport had no idea how many operations they had in 2000 when that Master Plan was created and that forecast is now 16 years old. He said an airport like Truckee’s that has no radar coverage relies on the flight tracking system that functions the same. Currently they have exact data, but back in 2000 they were relying on numbers that were not realistic. Ms. Thompson said they were also assuming operations on four runways instead of two, which is a huge difference. Commissioner Smith said the 2000 Airport Master Plan is quite a document if you have ever gotten into it. He said if they had followed it there would be a big terminal with jets from all over the United States. It just never happened.

Commissioner Collinson asked on the tweaks to the jurisdictions’ General Plans if they are going to be more restrictive or less restrictive. Ms. Thompson said where the zones have narrowed, which is displayed within the dash lines on the map provided, particularly along the sides of the runways, that is less restrictive. She said where the zones push out it will be a little more restrictive, particularly for the portion of the community that was previously outside the Airport Influence Area, so any development out there never came to the TTALUC. If there is a development proposal

it could trigger a TTALUC review. Ms. Thompson said, in terms of what the main issue out there would be, it is Part 77 for airspace review. She said if there is a proposal that extends above the tree line, then it may trigger a TTALUC review, as well as an FAA airspace review. If it is below the tree line for the most part, it can continue without being an issue. Executive Director Landon added that in Zone E there is no limit on the residential or nonresidential intensities; it is mainly a height issue and overflight consideration; Commissioner Montgomery said like cell towers. Commissioner Dee said if she understood correctly, all the tweaks to the General Plans would be just to bring their plans and maps into compliance with the updated TTALUCP. Chairman Anderson said it affects all three jurisdictions. Ms. Thompson said yes it does. She referred to pages 35 and 36 of the initial study and said it outlines the specific changes that would be needed for each of the General Plans. She said it is primarily dealing with the zoning ordinances, then there is an airport overlay zone adopted by each of the jurisdictions that essentially implements the TTALUCP that will be approved at this meeting and is in effect today. She said it is a minor tweak of the jurisdictions' maps and referencing the new plan.

Chairman Anderson asked Executive Director Landon if he would be informing the three jurisdictions of the tweaks and the need to update their General Plans. Executive Director Landon replied yes. Commissioner Montgomery asked what the time frame is for that. She said Placer County will be updating many of their community plans for this larger region. Ms. Thompson replied that the statute says it needs to be done in 180 days, but that typically cannot be done realistically with the environmental review and public review process that is in place. Usually, as long as you are making good effort to move forward and include these changes as part of your overall General Plan, it is typically sufficient for most ALUCs. Executive Director Landon said he believed the 180 day limit is there, but there is no punitive action if it is not achieved. That was correct. Commissioner Montgomery said maybe she misunderstood what Ms. Thompson was saying, but asked if the county's action for their area plans or community plans are just to be consistent with the new TTALUCP, and this plan has been through CEQA, would the counties and town just be able to make a Negative Declaration. Ms. Thompson said they could definitely reference the material in the TTALUCP, but she thought they would still be obligated to go through their own process, reference the material, and come to the same conclusion that there was no significant impact.

Commissioner Collinson asked, in reference to no comments received, if any public agencies wrote back that they had no comment. Executive Director Landon replied no, there was nothing received from any of the agencies that TTALUC staff submitted the TTALUCP to. Commissioner Dee attested that the Town of Truckee Council discussed the TTALUCP, but they had no comment on that particular plan. Commissioner Smith said he spoke with John McLaughlin, Community Development Director at the Town, about the Airport Master Plan and answered questions. Commissioner Dee encouraged him to speak with Tony Lashbrook at the Town as well. Commissioner Montgomery asked if Commissioner Smith spoke to anyone specifically at Placer County. He replied that he spoke with Stacy Wydra at Placer County Planning Department, Tahoe Office, but he did not sit down and go through it with her. He also contacted Brian Foss, Nevada County Planning Director. Commissioner Smith said the one thing they talked about that is applicable now is there is no question that the TTALUC adopted the Master Plan and these expansion zones are in effect. He said, however, what the FAA has said was they do not oppose them looking at the extension, but they have not approved it; that was the language they used. Commissioner Smith said the extension of the runway 500 feet is by no means a certainty that they can do. He said the FAA also will not pay for it and it is about a \$6.5 million project, so if the Airport District decides to do that in the next 5 years, or if within 5 years they do not do it, or at least the next time the Airport Master Plan is updated around 2024, this may go back if they decide not to do it. They would withdraw their plan to extend the runway. He said it was just like the two

extra runways; they put them in and it expanded both areas; they took the runways out and the areas shrink. He said the reason the Airport Board looked at the runway expansion was a dispersionary tactic to try to get more aircraft to use the crosswind runway; particularly aircraft coming in on that approach; they just want them to land on the runway. Commissioner Smith said what happens is the approach is at a slight angle and they come in and break out of the clouds and what a lot of them do is they circle around and land on Runway 29. He said that is partly because the crosswind runway is not long enough, so if they have 5,000 feet of runway length then their standard operating procedure for their company says they can just land. He said what they did with the runway is they lengthened it to 5,000 feet and made it 25 feet wider, so it is 100 feet wide, to try to get that traffic to land rather than do those circling procedures, which they think will lessen the noise. Commissioner Smith said he wanted the Commissioners to be aware of the background on why they planned it. He said if they decide as an Airport District not to do it, then they could talk to Mead & Hunt and amend the TTALUCP to move the boundaries back.

Commissioner Montgomery said the Placer County Board of Supervisors did discuss the plan a little bit and she discussed it with David Boesch, Placer County CEO. She understood what was just communicated about the new bump out of boundaries that is below the tree line and Placer County is reconsidering and redoing everything to try to limit the number of new cell towers, so they are not particularly concerned with the bump out of boundaries.

Chairman Anderson said it appeared that libraries are no longer discouraged in Zone D, which he thought they were in the prior document. Ms. Thompson replied that was a very specific question and she looked it up in the TTALUCP. She said that was correct. Commissioner Anderson said he thought schools, hospitals, and nursing homes were discouraged. Commissioner Anderson noted that the Railyard balloon track is in Zone D.

Chairman Anderson opened the PUBLIC HEARING at 10:55 a.m. There were no public comments. Chairman Anderson closed the PUBLIC HEARING.

Commissioner Dee made a motion to adopt Resolution 16-03 approving the Negative Declaration and adopting the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan update. Commissioner Montgomery seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously with Aye votes from Commissioners Anderson, Collinson, Dee, Foster, Montgomery, Powers, and Smith.

Commissioner Smith asked that the logo be changed on the front of the TTALUCP report to the Nevada County Transportation Commission rather than the Truckee Tahoe Airport District, to insure clarity as to whose document it is. That was agreed.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS – Continued

There were no further announcements. Executive Director Landon asked the Commissioners if it was working to email meeting packets to the members, or if they wished to receive hard copies. Commissioner Montgomery replied that it worked well for her. Chairman Anderson said he would like to receive hard copies of large maps in color; otherwise it works for him.

SCHEDULE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission will be held when the need arises.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Chairman Anderson adjourned the meeting at 10:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted: _____
Antoinette Perry, Administrative Assistant

Approved on: _____

By: _____
Richard Anderson, Chairman
Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Commission