

**AGENDA
CITY OF WATSONVILLE
WATSONVILLE AIRPORT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING**



Working with our community to create positive impact through service with heart.

Values: Teamwork, Integrity, Honesty, Service and Respect

Marjorie Bachmann - Representing Monterey Bay Ninety-Nines
Larry Lease - Representing Business Community
Orry Korb - Representing Watsonville Pilots Association
Dave Guerrieri - Representing on field Aviation Business Community
Joe Shelton - Representing Airport Area Residents residing in City
Glen Ceresa - Representing Airport Area Residents residing in County
Scott Randolph - Representing Experimental Aircraft Association#119

IF YOU CHALLENGE ANY ACTION APPEARING ON THIS AGENDA IN COURT, YOU MAY BE LIMITED TO RAISING ONLY THOSE ISSUES YOU OR SOMEONE ELSE RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETING DESCRIBED ON THIS AGENDA, OR IN WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE DELIVERED TO THE CITY CLERK PRIOR TO, OR AT, THE PUBLIC MEETING.

Remote Teleconference Meeting

Airport Zoom: <https://cityofwatsonville-org.zoomgov.com/j/1602455048>
Or iPhone one-tap: +16692545252,,1602455048#
Or Telephone: +1 669 254 5252 or +1 669 216 1590
Webinar ID: 160 245 5048

CORONAVIRUS (COVID-19) ADVISORY NOTICE

Consistent with Government Code section 54953(e), and in light of the declared state of emergency, the Regular Meeting will not be physically open to the public and all Members will be teleconferencing into the meeting via Zoom. To maximize public safety while still maintaining transparency and public access, members of the public can listen to the meeting by using the hyperlink below and may provide public comment by Zoom during the public comment period.

Americans with Disabilities Act



If you wish to attend a meeting and you will require assistance in order to attend and/or participate, please call the Watsonville Municipal Airport at least three (3) business days in advance of the meeting to make arrangements. The City of Watsonville TDD number is (831) 763-4075.



AGENDA
CITY OF WATSONVILLE
WATSONVILLE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Working with our community to create positive impact through service with heart.

Values: Teamwork, Integrity, Honesty, Service and Respect

Wednesday, January 26, 2022, 7:00 p.m.

Pages

- 1. ROLL CALL**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. PRESENTATIONS & ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

This time is set aside for members of the general public to address the Watsonville Airport Advisory Committee on any item not on the Agenda, which is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Watsonville Airport Advisory Committee. No action or discussion shall be taken on any item presented except that any Committee Members may respond to statements made or questions asked, or may ask questions for clarification. All matters of an administrative nature will be referred to staff. All matters relating to Watsonville Airport Advisory Committee will be noted in the minutes and may be scheduled for discussion at a future meeting or referred to staff for clarification and report. Any Committee Member may place matters brought up under Oral Communications on a future agenda. ALL SPEAKERS ARE ASKED TO ANNOUNCE THEIR NAME AND ADDRESS IN ORDER TO OBTAIN AN ACCURATE RECORD FOR THE MINUTES.

- 3.a. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC & COMMITTEE**
- 4. CONSENT AGENDA**

All items appearing on the Consent Agenda are recommended actions which are considered to be routine and will be acted upon as one consensus motion. Any items removed will be considered immediately after the consensus motion. The Chair will allow public input prior to the approval of the Consent Agenda.
- 4.a. MOTION APPROVING MINUTES OF 10/27/2021**
- 5. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA**
- 6. PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS**
- 6.a. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

1. OPERATIONAL UPDATES

- FUEL ISLAND RECONFIGURATION
- FUEL FARM LOADING RACK
- AVIATION STORAGE UNIT INSPECTIONS
- BONEYARD AIRCRAFT

2. ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

- RESTAURANT LEASEHOLD STATUS
- WATSONVILLE AIRPORT CENTER LEASEHOLDS

3. FINANCIAL UPDATES

- Q2 FINANCIAL REPORT
- FINANCIAL SETTLEMENTS
- FAA INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT \$295K/YR FOR FIVE YEARS

4. COMMUNITY OUTREACH

- FOURTH GRADE FIELD TRIPS
- MARCH "PINT-FOR-PINT" BLOOD DRIVE
- NEW CITY COUNCIL MEMBER TOURS- AIRPORT TOUR FEBRUARY 1ST

7. NEW BUSINESS

- 7.a. UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE NORDIC NATURALS LAND SWAP
- 7.b. UPDATE ON THE NEW GATE ENTRY PROCEDURES
- 7.c. UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE PROJECT AT 547 AIRPORT BLVD.
- 7.d. UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE PROPOSED SELF-STORAGE UNIT FACILITY AT 70 NIELSON ST.
- 7.e. UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED CITY WATER TOWER RESERVOIR
- 7.f. LAND SWAP FOR LUMBER YARD LAND

8. ADJOURNMENT

The next Committee meeting will be held on April 27, 2022

Pursuant to Section 54954.2(a)(1) of the Government Code of the State of California,

this agenda was posted at least 72 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting at a public place freely accessible to the public 24 hours a day and on the City of Watsonville website at <https://www.cityofwatsonville.org/1654/Watsonville-Airport-Advisory-Committee>.

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Watsonville Municipal Airport (100 Aviation Way) during normal business hours.

Such documents are also available on the City of Watsonville website at: <https://www.cityofwatsonville.org/1654/Watsonville-Airport-Advisory-Committee> subject to staff's ability to post the document before the meeting.

Minutes

**Regular Meeting of the Watsonville Airport Advisory Committee
Council Chambers
275 Main Street, 4th Floor, Watsonville, California
Minutes**

October 27, 2021

7:00 PM

1. ROLL CALL

Marjorie Bachman (Monterey Bay 99's), Larry Lease (Non-Aviation Business), Glen Ceresa (County Resident), Dave Guerrieri (Airport Fixed Based Operator), Orry Korb (Watsonville Pilot's Association), Joe Shelton (City Resident) Scott Randolph (EAA #119).

Absent: Larry Lease

Staff member present: Airport Director, Rayvon Williams, Assistant Administrative Analyst, Alexandra Aguado

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Lead by Dave Guerrieri

2. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Oral Communications from the Commissioners & Members of the Public

King: Maybe now. There you go. Hi, my name is Tiffany Ella King. I'm the owner of Ella's at the Airport, uh, out at the general aviation here in Watsonville, and, uh, I'm here to address two problems that I currently have. Uh, Problem 1 is the difficulty that I'm currently faced with, the City of Watsonville management to approve the qualified successor that I have in contract for the business, Ella's at the Airport. Uh, we currently have a vetted buyer that showed physical responsibility and management acumen to the City of Watsonville, and, uh, she has strength and, uh, we got into contract with her and presented her to the City of Watsonville at the end of September. She's buying Ella's concept. The recipes, the logos, the customer list, everything. This assignee does not want to change anything but just make Ella's brand better. She owns a general aviation restaurant currently, and when I spoke to the airport director down there, he said she's an outstanding tenant. She's a great operator. She actually bought that business about 5 years ago, and when she bought that business, he said it was a seamless transition, so she's done a great job with it. We've received no formal explanation or declination for her and this, like I said, was well over a month ago that we asked the city to weigh in on this, but Problem No. 2 is our lease is currently expiring as of, I think, tomorrow, and I am set in, in current limbo right now. I have not seen a new lease to even review with my attorney, and, uh, we did sign a letter of intent 2 months ago with the city, but I have not seen an actual lease. I'm wary of entering into a new lease with the City of Watsonville because my current one I have found is unduly restrictive and discriminatory on actually finding a new assignee and specifically around that purpose. Right now, my lease states that the landlord may object to any proposed assignment and that the landlord has sole and unfettered opinion that they may not qualify the assignee for their financial strength business acumen. It goes on, and then it ends with landlord may object on any other grounds. I have asked for that to be just reviewed and feel like it is undue because now I find myself in this challenge where I am trying to sell my restaurant to what seems like she's more qualified than I was when I was given the opportunity to create a business, uh, at Ella's at the Airport. Remember it was closed. It had been closed for, I think, a year. I had a 6-month-old at that time. I was running a café as you all know over there

on East Lake Avenue that did not even have a hood, and yet this woman is supposedly not qualified, and I want to, uh, I just want this to be known that I have tried to find a good assignee, someone that is qualified 'cause I want Ella's to continue, but I am between a rock and a hard place right now, and I am very concerned about the current lease, and I don't, I, I don't know how I'm going to be able to fit the mold that they are looking for, this angel. Thank you.

Bachman: Thank you, Tiffany. Rayvon, do you have anything to report about that issue at this time?

Williams: No.

Bachman: Okay. We would like to ask that maybe we get a report from the airport staff, um, sent to the WAAC.

Bachman: Would that be possible?

Williams: Okay.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Motion Approving Minutes for July 28, 2021 Meeting- Motion was initiated by Randolph and Seconded by Shelton. Quorum met. Minutes passed.

4. ITEMS REMOVED FROM AGENDA

5. PRESENTATIONS & REPORTS

6.a. Director's Report

Williams: Test, test. Good evening, everyone. Uh, you'll notice on the agenda under, uh, Director's Report 6A there are five items. There will be a sixth item I would like to add. It's a late addition. It's the, uh, quarterly financial update, and I'll explain that when we get there. Uh, relative to the, uh, regulations update, the schedule for the regulation process update was noticed to, uh, permit holders, lease holders and users on September 29th, 2021. Uh, based on the scope of the proposed updates, airport management determined providing the proposed document, posting comments, commenting on the comments and working with the WAAC as an advisory committee to review the comment would be the mo, comments would be the most effective way to move forward, uh, and gather input and implement the, uh, changes. The, the letter that was sent on the 29th was shared with the WAAC in advance. It goes back to our January 2020 process in which we went to the WAAC and said hey, we're gonna send this letter out and it has a number of changes. Most of them are edits, modifications, clarifications. Some rules that we had put in place in the past that we had believed that these rules really don't fit us, and we can do better. Uh, corporate hangar, uh, availability was one. Allowing conveyances in the hangars as long as they didn't input moving aircraft in and out. So, we determined that over time we've discovered that we can do better relative to serving tenants and trying to deal with the realities that we have on the field. The corporate hangar one was a good example because we just don't have jets that are coming to Watsonville and so why are we restricting it to jets and aircraft of a certain wingspan, and so we should just go ahead and delete that regulation. When it came to aviation storage utility, we checked with other airports and found that we can in fact allow certain vehicles, snowmobiles and boats and things, as long as they don't impact the storage utility or what the FAA calls, or what airport managers call aviation utility. Being able to move the aircraft in and out. So, we went through our regulations, and we looked at them and we decided to, what we thought were pretty well straightforward, innocuous and, and, and clear regulations that could be edited without too much of a hassle. When we, um, were in the United flight litigation, there were a number of regulations in there that, based on Judge Volkmann's decision, we have to totally remove, and so we just

removed those. Transient parking, uh, a, ho, uh, taxi lanes. We just took them straight out. They were in an original version, but we just said Judge Volkmann has made the decision. His decision is based on historical access for United flight. We're not gonna fight that. We're not gonna, we're not gonna do anything that will be viewed as vindictive. We're not gonna change anything. We're not gonna do any remarking. We're not gonna move anything. We're just gonna go ahead and, uh, adhere to his decision, and we have done so. So, with that said, we sent a note to the WAAC and said based on this we're going to go ahead and publish the updated regulations. The updated regulations, the red font is the only change. Everything has been in place since either 2017 or 2019, and so we published those, and there was at least one individual on the WAAC that said hey, wait a minute. You know, early on you had noted that we'd go back and do the same thing that we did in 2017 where we'd have a, a committee and we would review, and my comment to that WAAC member was, yeah, we did say that but that's a lotta time and effort for what's basically 20 or 30 items that are edits, and we believe that we can do the same thing and give everybody the same opportunity to comment and we'll listen to their comments and we'll take them into consideration, and we'll work with you guys as the advisory committee, and we'll publish something out so that we get it out by December 1st, so then as we move into the new year with the hangar inspections we'll be good to go. So, when we sent that out to the WAAC, uh, their comments were, their comments were okay, we understand that, but let's see what the other WAAC members say. We didn't hear from the other WAAC members. We waited for a while and that's when we sent the letter out on September 29th saying that okay, October 1st we're gonna post 'em. Since October 1st, today being the 27th, we've received 52 comments and we've been very diligent that as soon as we get a comment in, the management team, myself, Alex and Sam, we get together. We look at it. We look at the regulations. We've found out of the 52 comments there are some, there are some very good points and we're gonna have to go back and make those changes, and we, we will do. Uh, so we're gonna make those changes and we want this night, tonight, to be your opportunity, and this is a good time to do it, to come up and state any concerns you have. The idea is not to we're gonna do this anyway. The idea is to glean input. We, we gotta get, get input. We want your input. We wanna take that input. We wanna document it. We wanna talk with your duly appointed representatives and see how we can improve our regulations for safety, service and self-sustainability. So that's where we are with the, uh, with the update.

Bachman: I would just like to go on the record one last time, uh, reminding you, Rayvon, and the WAAC members that the May 5th meeting, in the minutes it says you can certainly rest assured that once the ruling is done and we will repeat that process, we will present to the WAAC what we want to do and make a call for volunteers to serve on a review committee. We will listen to all of the comments. The physical way that we did that was through a spreadsheet, so I feel like we were promised to have a review committee and a townhall meeting, so that's what I'm asking for. Just on the record.

Korb: Is that a motion?

Bachman: No, that – well, I didn't make a motion, but I wanted to put it on the record that that's what, as the chairperson, I'm asking to have that process put into place. Even though we've already got a good share of public comments, I think it would be important for the pilots to actually have their voices heard and to sit together in a little bit, in a different venue than here tonight. We can go over it tonight. We can spend time on it tonight, but I think a venue of the townhall meeting would be a better opportunity.

Williams: Oh, okay, okay, if I can comment. So, if you –

Bachman: Sure.

Williams: – Yeah, I understand. Right. I understand the commitment. That commitment was made. I would ask that, um, I, I have a question basically. So, we went to these 30 items that were listed on the back. Um, I don't think any of them are what I w, what we would characterize as controversial. Right? And

I'm just trying to understand. I mean there, there are it, is, is every item on here something that, that, that, that there's an issue with? I mean what we're trying to do is what we're doing is we're looking at the regulations and we're trying to figure out how we can tweak them to the benefit of the pilots, and the first one, deleting the corporate hangar, I mean are we gonna through each, is the idea to go through each and every one? I mean I, I don't see – and, and this was a discussion that we had at the office, right.

Bachman: Right.

Williams: I mean to, to, to have a co, to have this session and to go through this, I just don't see the value of working through all of these where, as you, as the duly appointed representatives for the pilots, we can work with you guys. They've made 52 comments. We have that information. We responded to those 52 comments, and I'm just trying to understand what's gonna be different.

Korb: Um, well I'm not gonna tell you what's going to be different. I think, um, what happened is people have one look at the rules and one opportunity to comment. Um, I'm fairly certain, uh, people have more to say about the rules –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: – and have a response to your responses.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: Uh, and also, um, have feelings about, uh, a process that should be engaged in and, um, analyzing whether rules are necessary and to what extent a rule, um, if necessary, um, should be, um, imposed. Uh, I, to me it's a process and when, uh, you gave us the assurance, and it wasn't just us as –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: – the, as a body, it was to the community of the airport that, that this process was going to be, um, a larger process that would, um, fully vet, um, the rules and regulations in a public manner, I think that's everybody's, um, reasonable expectation. Um, how that process rolls out, um, I can't, um, um, tell you right now.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: All I can say is that's the promise that was made.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: And I think it's, um, it's a commitment that has to be met –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: – and so for the sake of the body, I'll make a motion, um, because I think that, uh, we should weigh in, um, on, uh, on the process, um, that, uh, that goes forward in, uh, considering and ultimately coming to a conclusion regarding, uh, rule changes, um, and, um, and so my motion is that the –

Williams: If we, whether you make –

Korb: – process that was outlined at the, uh, last meeting of the WAAC by you.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: Uh, be the process that is employed, um, uh, in, in this manner. That's my motion and, um, seconder?

Williams: Okay. My comment, my comment has to do with the, um, the document that was, that's produced and on, and is online, the comments that we received, a good portion of the comments aren't relevant to the proposed regulation updates. There are comments on things that have approved back in 2017. We don't s, I mean we, we spend ti, we had to spend time going back and saying well wait a minute, this is, this isn't even a po, proposed to be changed. We're not, I don't believe we're in a position which we're gonna go back and review regulations that have already been vetted, discussed, went through a committee and change those again, so we're not, that, that is not something that we don't think is reasonable to, to do.

Bachman: How many of the 52 comments do you think are pertinent to the –

Williams: I –

Bachman: – updates?

Williams: – I, I would – here, here's another thing. It's, you know, if, if we take the time to do it, you gotta take the time to read it, but to ans, but to answer your question, but to answer your question –

Bachman: Well, I think –

Williams: – but to answer your question –

Bachman: – just since yesterday it doubled in size. I, I saw it –

Williams: Uh, it we, it went –

Bachman: – from the 25th.

Williams: – well one, well one person comes in and, and adds 20, uh, 12 or 15 and 15, and, and half of those are s, 2017 regulations, and we had to go back and say well wait a minute. You know, this is, this isn't even discussed, so I would say out of the 50 at least maybe 15, 20 percent, right. So, so it's a small, it's a small number. A, additionally there, there was a major –

Bachman: 15 or 20 percent that are –

Williams: Uh, r –

Bachman: – current or –

Williams: Yeah.

Bachman: – old? So –

Williams: The o, 15, I would say that out of the 55, I'm, I'm gonna be conservative, 10 of them, 7 to 10 are references to, that we're not updating them.

Bachman: Right. Okay.

Williams: That we, we didn't make a change to 'em.

Bachman: So maybe 80 percent are –

Williams: Fair enough.

Bachman: – updates. Okay.

Williams: Fair, fair enough, and then, and then out of those 80 percent many of those are on items that we have discussed in the past and either through the airport layout plan. A, a, a good example is turf runway. We're looking at, through the airport layout plan, what the FAA calls an alternate runway, and in our early discussions with them it doesn't look good. It does not look good, and even though I'm trying to figure with a consultant where we can put one, it doesn't look good. To lead people down a discussion for something that I don't think is gonna happen, I don't think, I think that's disingenuous. All right. So that's one point. A second point is that the, the, the, the challenge with administrative citations. Administrative citations has already been approved by the city council. It's in the municipal code. We're, we're not go, we're not gonna change that, and the rationale that we placed in the explanation we believe is one that individuals seem to think they're criminal citations. They are not. Our commitment, and we've done this consistently, is to educate and only enforce if we have to. We've been doing this for over a year now. We've only issued one citation. I mean and, and so there, there are things that are in the, that people wanna talk about right, and, and I, and when we went through this, our perspective is, you know, is this really something that we wanna spend the time on and are we leading people down a path in which they think yeah, they're gonna make this change, and then when we don't get there it's like well you knew that all along. I'd just rather be upfront and open and honest with what's, what's going on. I mean those, those are two of the, the key ones, you know, that, that are, that are, I just see that it's happening, and I don't want the people that are tenants that have, have a, that have a chance to look at this and that we're, we're living with this every day, to think that we're trying to do an okie doke on 'em because we're not, and so, so those are just, those are just two, right, and, and so, but, but I hear the motion. Man of my word. I w, I will tell you this. If we can get together as a, um, I, I, my, my perspective is the WAAC is the duly appointed representatives across the, the, the, uh, the pilot community. You're, you're on the WAAC. You're all tenants. You're all pilots. You're all individuals that are known by the community. If there's anyone that could be trusted I would hope that we could use you guys to address those items that are f, that are highlighted in boldface print.

Randolph: The scope. I, I, I started having to take notes to keep track of all the things I wanted to respond to –

Williams: Sorry.

Randolph: – so I'd like to have a discussion rather than, than –

Williams: Okay.

Randolph: – kind of –

Williams: Let up. Okay.

Randolph: – long theses. Um, I think to, to, to Orry's point about process, right, that's why I seconded the

motion –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Randolph: – I think, I, I believe in that process. Um, I think we can do some things potentially to optimize it a little bit. If you find that there are edits that have no comments by the time we get to the, the, the, the point of public meeting for example, might make sense to just have all those on one side and say here's all the things nobody commented on, and we just dispense with these. Right, and, and move past them. Similar, you know, in spirit similar to how we do consent agenda items. Right? Move past 'em.

Williams: Okay.

Randolph: There, there's a lotta easy stuff.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Randolph: There's more controversial stuff.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Randolph: Right? When I read through them and, and one of the things about the process is it's important for us and the community to know when to make the investment. It's a lot to read and it's a lot to process, and as, as they involve it's important to know when to make the investment and doing that vetting, and if the process suddenly changes you, you, you, you know, that's, that's a problem –

Williams: Fair enough.

Randolph: – so I've been through 'em a couple a times now, um, and I was, I was somewhat involved in, in the previous versions as well so I have some familiarity with 'em. I think it's a little bit, um, uneven or, or lopsided to say we're not gonna reopen old rules. That's exactly what you're doing. You've identified rules that haven't served the airport's needs and you're editing them. That makes sense. It's a good thing to do, but if the community identifies rules that aren't meeting their needs and suggests edits, that's a conversation worth having. It's, it's within your power to say yeah, I disagree, I don't wanna make that change, but that's part of this process. So, I think it's, it's not good practice to exclude discussion of existing rules. I think you'd wanna set the bounds about like well, you know, let's, let's be clear, right. Let's, let's set up the meeting. Consent agenda for the things that aren't controversial. The things that we're changing that are controversial, let's have a discussion, and here's some things that came up in the comments that are old news, but if you have comments let's hear 'em. Let's have a, let's have a, a real valid discussion on that. So, I, I'd like to see it work something along those lines. Um, now I'm gonna go back to my notes for the, for the points that came up. Um, citations in particulars is, is something, you know, I've commented to you on. Um, if it's already existing process and it's already existing rule in the city governance, and it's already how the airport's running, then I wonder why are we writing it in as, as red text in a, in a different place, right? It seems like we're making trouble for you and for everybody else to, to tr, make it look like it's a new issue. Um, if people have issues they can talk to you about it, but we don't need duplication of, of rules. Fewer rules the better in my book right. We, we need some rules, but we don't want, we don't wanna get buried in 'em. Um, so I'd suggest if it's already process, already practice, why write it again? Let's, let's just strike that and, and use the existing governance. Um, the last comment, and, and really my first comment from before was, um, in terms of process, I had submitted some comments. Um, I th, believe I recall, and this is just personal recollection, at least three WAAC members responding to the discussion about publishing the, the, uh, new rules. So, the characterization of getting no response from one WAAC member I think is not accurate. Um, my own response, personal response, um,

asked for comments in the previous round to be incorporated, right, to not reset all those comments. Um, you responded to me that, that they were included. I did not find my own comments included, so, so somewhere they got lost, so I'd, I'd like to figure out where those went and make sure they are incoo, incorporated.

Williams: Cu, couple of things. Let me just go in reverse order. Every comment that we received, either at the early WAAC meeting or via the website, we just basically cut and paste it and put it in there. Um, portions of the comment that had personal kind of things, we did, we, we just included the meat of the content, context, so I'll go back and look, but I would, I thi, we took great pains, and so if, if you made a statement to me, either, going in reverse order, on the website via the pulldown link, in an email you sent me, out of the WAAC, out of the WAAC minutes, we made every effort to put 'em in there. So, I would ask you to go back and look again, because what we would do is we would take the comments and we just put 'em in a fi, we'd copy, copy 'em and put 'em in a file because 2019, 2017, 2015, we've kind of been through this spreadsheet thing, and that's not even including the parachute issue. So, we kinda know how to keep track of this. So, I'll go back. You got back and look. Relative to the –

Bachman: In, in regards to that, when you and I were corresponding and the WAAC, you know, including the WAAC, that, those are the emails –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Bachman: – when Scott and Dave –

Williams: Yeah.

Bachman: – both commented.

Williams: Yes, and that's, and that's my comment. My, my comment isn't, isn't that you didn't comment. That ea – on Sept – in early, in mid-September we sent a letter to, we sent a letter saying hey, here's the letter. So, the date of the letter was, the date of the email was September 22nd. We're sending this email, uh, it was September 19th, the week before. Hey, we're sending this email out next week. Marjorie commented on the timing. Dave made a comment on the content. You made a content on the content. No one made a comment on the, the, the timing at that point. Marjorie said hey guys, she sent this email out. He's gonna send this out on Friday. Comment. There was no comment. I told Marjorie, I, I said, Marjorie, rest assured. Doesn't have to go out Friday. We'll wait. Saturday, Sunday, Monday comes no comment. Marjorie, we'll wait 'til Wednesday. Still no comment. So, we, we, I mean we, we, we didn't hear. Marjorie sent my letter out again saying hey, he's sending this out. No comment. It wasn't until the letter got out that we got a, I got a email from Orry. Hey, Rayvon, I understand but I fully support Marjorie's comment. Will you reconsider, and my comment was let's let the process run, but let me, let me just cut to the quick. I think your comment relevant to holistic view of the regulations, I think that's a fair comment. Right? But the idea to go back and kinda rewrite them every 2 years because what we're doing with this 2-year assessment is we're putting these regulations in place, and Marjorie brought up a very good question today. She said, Rayvon, you put these in place and the people out there don't know what's, don't know what's behind it, but I would submit to you that, you know, that's, that's not true. We, when the guy was painting in the hangar, we blasted that out to everyone. Don't paint in the hangar. When the guy was buying fuel from the island, we blasted that to everyone. Don't be this guy. When the guy was flying his, his paraglider into the PLA, we said don't do that. When the person was camping under his wing during COVID, we said don't do that. So, so, so the challenge that we have is we, we get all these things together and people come to us and say your regulations never said I didn't do that, and so the whole thing with the citation, the reason we brought the citation is because we talked about it, and I told them. I said it's not fair that we don't tell them that we're putting citations in the regulations. We should do that even though it's in

the city. They don't read the municipal code. We need to add it because it's happening, and the whole idea behind segu, se, uh, citations then I'm done with this is 95 percent of the people out there are absolutely compliant. I just wanna go to my hangar, fly my airplane, buy my fuel, got to the restaurant, have some fun, fly Young Eagles, fly formation. I just wanna, I, enter the pattern. The, I just wanna fly. However, when there are individuals that act against employees and blatantly taunt, we have to have, without impunity, what are we to do? So that's where the citation comes around. But, but to that point, I, I'm, I'm more than willing to say okay. Let's figure, you guys are gonna vote on it. I, I, I'm, I can read the tea leaves so I'm, I'm trying to understand here, you know, what would you recommend. You want, you want us to go out and –

Randolph: I, I, I did give you recommendation in terms of an agenda, way to structure it efficiently.

Williams: Yeah, yeah, I, I –

Randolph: The other thing I would say is, is I would encourage you and your staff to look at this as an education opportunity. Right? Um, you know, a lot of us are old timers. We've been around, right. We, we, we remember the guy who painted in his hangar and, and, and how that goes. Not everybody is in that boat. Right? We have people coming to the airport all the time, we hope, and, and joining the community, so I think it's, it's worthwhile to kinda refresh that message and, and do that educational process, and, and, and not assume that everybody's got, you know, the 10 and 15 and 20 years of history.

Williams: But, but, Scott, we do the e, we, we, I mean it's easy to say that, right, but we ha, we alert lists, letters. I mean we –

Randolph: Don't, don't hear this as a criticism –

Williams: No, no, I'm not –

Randolph: – merely as this is an evening, this is an opportunity for an evening of education.

Williams: No, no, uh, fair enough. If, if it's an opportunity for an evening of education, it's an opportunity for people to also say you know what, you used a keyword, invested. How invested are you in the airport? How truly invested are you in the airport? That's a, that's an education.

Randolph: Yeah.

Williams: That, that's an education that I think that people, because it's easy. 85 percent of the people at the airport don't live in the city. That's a very important metric. That's a very important metric, and we as a group of individuals, and I'm one of 'em. I'm absolutely one of 'em. Based here, been here, flown here, instructed here. I'm one of 'em. We need to get that, and so back to the point in question. I'm more than willing to adhere as, as already said. You, we can certainly go back and look at here are the things that no one had a problem with. I'm more than willing to do that. Here are the things that people seem to have a problem with. I'll take it a step further. Here are the things that you might have a problem with, but it doesn't look like it's gonna change, and here's why, because I don't want, I don't want people thinking that we're making this stuff up with –

Randolph: I think the here's why –

Williams: – and –

Randolph: – is a very valuable element.

Williams: Oh, okay, and, and then, and then here's the list, here's the other stuff. Right? But I have a question for you. So, I never did like Rule No. 2225. How, how does that work? Someone just says I just don't, I mean I don't, I don't, perfect example. The whole idea of unattended parking is so that you can, people seem to think that I can't park outside my hangar. Of course, you can. I park outside my hangar all the time. You can park outside your hangar. You can do your maintenance. You can be out there. As long as you n, if you need to move your vehicle, move your vehicle. When you're not flying, put your vehicle inside. We've had individuals get in airplanes, crank 'em up, and, and, and slice in the doors leaving the engine running. We've had people, you know, hit other cars, right, and so the, the, the education we're saying, the regulation isn't meant to be onerous. It's just, it's a safety thing. So, but if someone doesn't like that, and we're committed to that, what's the answer?

Randolph: I, I, I think right, right here you, you've, you've answered that. You, you, you say well, we, we need to have this because we have had these problems and we're, we're committed to –

Williams: Okay.

Randolph: – keeping this. Thank you for your concern.

Williams: Okay.

Randolph: You know.

Williams: Okay.

Randolph: And, and if, yeah. I, I think that's, that's it.

Williams: Okay.

Randolph: You know, there's a disagree and commit.

Williams: Okay. No, that's fine because it, it's my –

Randolph: It's important to have the, the conversation.

Williams: And, and my final point is, I'm, I'm, so I'm committed to do that. I'm, I'm s, the structure you laid out, what was missed, that's off the table. Here are the concerns. I hear the concerns but here's the answer. Uh, here, hey I just don't like that rule. Here's why it is.

Randolph: Yeah.

Williams: Right, so now we're getting down to a little bit, I, I would just say this. If we go back to 2015 when the muni, municipal code was done, and 2017 when we had the first one, and 2019 when we didn't have one in 2019. We just said hey, here are a few changes and there was no, um, no complaint, but you preci, specifically said, Rayon, don't do that again. In the future, make sure you let us know, and we said okay. So, my goal is as time goes on, and every 2 years we should be doing this 'cause it is a best practice. We're just trying to get better, but what we're finding is there's less and less. So, in 2023 or 2, 23, I'm hoping that there's e, there'll be even fewer because we're trying to get to the point where it's, they know what to expect. I know what to expect. You guys know what to expect –

Randolph: Mm hmm.

Williams: – and we can operate in a way that's safe, service and self-sustaining.

Randolph: I, I, I'm with you on that. I think every 2 years is probably not an unreasonable time to give all the **** of the airport, including the city residents and everybody, um, an opportunity to voice concerns, thi, things they've experienced with the rules, right. What's worked for us since the last 2 years? What hasn't worked for us? Man, it was really a hardship that I had to put my car in my hangar and here's why. Let's have that discussion and, and maybe it comes out the same place but it's, it's not unreasonable to have that –

Williams: Okay.

Next Speaker: – review so, so, so I applaud that process and look forward to it.

Next Speaker: Okay. All right. So, then my final question would be how would you like to constitute the group? You guys wanna do it? Do you wanna go back to my comment and ask for volunteers? How do you wanna do it?

Bachman: I think it'd be good to have a review committee to go over some of these things to start with. Uh, perhaps the three WAAC members from the pilot organizations, 99s, WPA and EAA, and then have maybe two more representatives from each group have a review committee and sit down with you. Everybody commits to reading the comments. The re, review committee meet and go over Scott's process in some form.

Williams: I, I, I would, I would encourage you to consider, um, not just limiting it to The 99s, the WPA and the, um, and, and the EAA, right, simply because the o, the other positions are meaning positions too.

Korb: That's **** have some particular rules applied to them for example.

Bachman: We'll how about all the WAAC members if everyone would be willing to do it. Would everybody –

Korb: I, I'm not willing to do something on top of the WAAC. I think that our representative, uh, the groups that we represent can appoint some – this is an add-on committee, and I, I think, um, our, our re, our, you know, appointing groups can, uh, appoint s, you know, individuals, um, to represent all of the various, um, parties, uh, who are represented on the WAAC to sit on this committee. I, I, I just can't do a –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: – another, um, committee on top of this work so.

Williams: What, what, what would you, would it be, if the at, if the WPA, the EAA and The 99s each appointed someone, right, and then the other, uh, three groups because, I mean they have value. They join. Now you have that committee.

Korb: Right.

Williams: If they were okay with that, would that be reasonable?

Korb: I think that's perfectly reasonable.

Williams: Gary? Dave? Joe?

WAAC Members: Yeah.

Williams: And Glen? Okay.

Bachman: And I wasn't trying to exclude you guys.

Korb: Yeah, just don't, just don't make me do another committee. Yeah.

Next Speaker: So that would be the review committee.

WAAC Member: ****.

WAAC Member: Right.

Bachman: And then to have a townhall meeting with all the pilots that want to come. All the community that wants to come, pilots, non-pilots.

Williams If that's what you want.

Korb: That's what I want, or at least that's what my motion asked for because it's the process that was previously outlined.

Williams: Okay.

Bachman: Any more discussion?

Korb: Yeah. I just wanna make a final comment. I, um, thank you, Rayvon, for mentioning that I did, um, uh, get back to you. It was a little after the, um, uh, letter went out unfortunately, but I, I also wanna just say generally that, um –

Aguado: Sorry, Orry, to interrupt but when you, um, when you guys speak can you say your name and then speak into the mic so it can record?

Korb: You want me to say my name before I speak? Is that –

Aguado: Well not every single time, but like – yes

Korb: Well, this is Orry Korb here. Um, and, uh, my f, my, uh, general concern is that we meet on a quarterly basis, um, and, um, I can tell you that once the meeting is over, I breathe a sigh of relief and go on with the rest of my life, uh, which is crowded with a lot of other things including hundreds of email messages that I seem to receive every day and text messages. I don't read everything I get. I, I just don't. Um, I'm, I'm selective, um, for any number of reasons, um, and I don't really think it's, um, it's, it's appropriate to expect that business of this body is going to be conducted effectively, uh, offline. Um, I think it's fair to send out information, uh, and, um, you know, hope that people get it, uh, but to actually basically design process, make decisions, particularly decisions that are contrary to, um, at least something that was discussed, um, in, in a public meeting, I, I just think is, is inappropriate. Um, I, you know, I, I'm not questioning the intent, uh, related to it, but it just doesn't work, um, and, you know, people don't respond to emails for any number of reasons and it's not generally, I don't think it's fair to assume it's because they don't care about, um, what they were asked. They may not even know what they were asked because they

may be – yeah, I'm sorry about that. Um, but my point is, uh, if, if it's, if it's important then it should occur in the meeting, um, and if it's something related to something that happened in a meeting, then it should occur in a subsequent meeting. Uh, information is a different issue, but decision making shouldn't happen outside of the meeting. Uh, with that I, I'm, I'm going to ask, unless anybody else has a comment, that you called the vote.

Williams: One, one, one comment. The, um, I understand what you're saying. Um, there's no, there's nothing to say that the, the committee can't meet more frequently, if, if that's what you guys desire. If you wanna, if you wanna move it to every other month, we could do that. You, it, it's not lost on me that you're volunteers. It's not lo, I, I, I get that right. Um, as I, as I've shared with, with Marjorie, you know, the, you, you've stepped into this role. You've made it very clear in the bylaws what your goal is. You've made it very clear in your actions and statements that you represent these individuals out here so there's, there's, there's, you've, you've made a commitment, and the, and, and we have made a commitment to the city that says hey, look. The, the city is pretty tenuous about the Watsonville Airport com, Advisory Committee, and I had made it clear to them, you know, this is how for lack of a better word, you stay in line with the pilots. I mean the, the, mi, I have worked tirelessly to try to figure out a way to con, to, look at your, look at yourselves. Look, look at you as a membership. This, this group has come a long way because you're more than just the, the WPA. You're Marjorie, you're Scott, you're Dave. These are the people out there that know who you are, and I have tried my best to see hey, these are indivi, it's a team of rivals. We don't always agree, and so all I would ask you to do is, you know, I go back to Glen. The first time he said hey, would you like to work on the fly in carrying garbage cans. That's the investment in the airport so I, I, I, I hear what you're saying, Orry. I'm just asking if, if there's anything that we can do on the airport side to assist and make it easier for you, let me know, but ultimately, we are looking to you guys to be the representatives of the individuals that are out there. Hold us accountable. I don't, I don't mind being held accountable. I, I think you would agree with that, Marjorie, and, and we're trying to do the, the best that we can, and so those, those are my closing comments.

Kory: Yeah. I'm not ca, casting any aspersions. Um, I'm just talking about process. Um, and, and again I think information is, is fair to pass out in between meetings. Uh, if, um, something important does come up that requires, uh, you know, uh, the committee to gather, it's possible to hold a special meeting, um, but that can be done. Um, so I think there are all sorts of ways of dealing with issues and it's not necessary to change the, the manner in which we meet right now. Um, I'm just saying that if we're gonna make a decision on something, I'd like to make it in public.

Bachman: All right. It's time to take our vote on the motion at hand. All those in favor say aye.

WAAC Member: Aye.

WAAC Member: Aye.

WAAC Meeting: Aye.

Bachman: All those opposed. Well, the motion carries.

WAAC Member: Thank you.

Bachman: Uh, just wanna ask the public since a few of you may have come to make comments about the regulations, since we'll be holding a townhall meeting, you might wanna hold those comments until the townhall meeting, but if anybody would like to get up and make a comment now, they are welcome to have their 2-minute say. Can I see a ha, a show of hands of everybody that wants to make their comments tonight? Come on up, Barry.

WAAC Member: Turn on the mic?

Bachman: Yeah. Here. It's on for you, Barry.

Porter: Hmm. Do you need more information?

WAAC Member: ****.

Bachman: He, he's got it now.

Porter: Hello?

WAAC Member: There you go.

Porter: All right. Sorry. Barry Porter, um, 610 Fair Road. I live in Bonny Dune. Um, I ha, am a tenant, uh, with a Cub in a hangar here at the airport and, um, I'd like to thank the WAAC for going ahead and approving the motion for the review and townhall process, and, uh, I'd also like to say that I agree with the statement that other previous rules should be on the table here for the discussion going forward, um, and then I'd just like to make a general comment. I have, I have many issues with many of the rules, and I have, uh, returned comments on them, but I'd also like to say that in regard to the general process of creating or assessing hazards that are perceived on the airport, um, I work for the Air Force at, uh, the national full-scale wind tunnel at Moffat Field. As a test engineer there, I'm heavily involved in the process of assessing hazards regards to tests, the facility, um, you know, general operations on the NASA campus, and I think there's a process that I don't really see, don't see evidence of happening here, and, and the way that process works in our organization is you scour the terrain for ha, perceived hazards. You list them, and then you go through, and you try to assign an initial, um, you know, severity of that hazard and, and also its probability of occurrence, and you use a standard test matrix to identify how those two things work together on a chart. You know, something is severe consequence and extremely likely to happen. That makes it a very high risk. Something is, potentially has severe consequences but it's incredibly unlikely to happen, it ends up in that matrix on a very, very low risk, and from that assessment, and that assessment is achieved throughout a group, kind of what you're proposing here. You know, representatives from various bodies, management – that the clock?

WAAC Member: Like ****.

WAAC Member: Oh, is that the 2 minutes?

WAAC Member: Yeah, I think that is.

Bachman: I don't know what that was. All right. Keep going, Barry.

Porter: Okay. So, I'll try to make it quick. Anyway, um, you know, the, the group gets together. They assess –

WAAC Member: ****.

Porter: – assess what the risk is. Assign it a relative, uh, risk assessment, and then they look at mitigation for that, and in the worst-case scenario the mitigation is some kind of rule, some kind of engineering control, some kind of procedural control if you can't figure out some other way to mitigate that, and I guess what I'm saying in general is the goal is to try to reduce the number of hard rules that come out

of something. Figure out ways to address issues and make it very transparent what this entire process is, and, uh, I think I got off my notes here, but anyway there is a process that I think is a standardized process, especially in government. I think that's what we ought a be using here, and I'd like to emphasize that when a review board convenes that they, you know, take advantage of that existing, existing process in moving forward, and I thank you for your time.

Next Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Barry.

Korb: It's my hope that WPA, um, appoints Barry to the, uh, review committee.

Bachman: All right, Rayvon, would you like to continue with your director's report?

Williams: If, if, if there are not any other comments.

Bachman: I didn't s –

Williams: There may be other comments.

Bachman: – anybody else like to speak from the public?

Lezin I just wanna say that I think it's very –

Bachman: You say your name first.

Lezin: My name is Jeremy Lezin. Used to be WAAC member, and I just wanna say I think it's really important, um, that the airport not be defensive in this process, and I, and I'm curious. I don't think they'll have an answer, but if the committee feels very strongly one direction and airport management says no, I feel this way, I don't want it to become another case like the barricades where it ends up being a lawsuit and everybody's angry, and there's no logic involved, and so I'm hoping that in the process there's some resolution for moving forward. Thank you.

Bachman: Thank you, Jeremy. Anyone else?

Sievert: David Sievert. Um, this I probably should've approached in the beginning, um, first comments. I can't remember if it was, and I apologize and you can cut me off if you want, but I, I had a real issue on the, uh, raising of rents, uh, this year. When we got our notice in the end of May that, uh, hangar rents would be going up 5 percent and there would be a, a raise in rent on the end rooms as well. Uh, having two end rooms, one of them since 1981, I have a vested interest in that, um, but there was no number of what was going to happen with that. Um, come July 1st I got a bill for \$200.00 for my two end rooms that I had been paying \$89.00 a month up to that point. Uh, I asked why, why did it go so much without a comment. Why didn't they, why weren't we not given 1 months' notice to em, to vacate an end room if we wanted to? Didn't. Immediately had this bill in front of us. I protested. I va, vacated one of my end rooms. I've re, withheld the, the additional rent for those two end rooms for 1 month. I'm still holding it in protest. I don't know. It's never been addressed why we didn't get 30-day notice of what that rate was gonna go to. Thank you.

Bachman: Thank you, David. Well, I take that show as no more public comments and we'll move back to Rayvon's Airport Director No. 2.

Williams: Uh, th, this item ha, is, um, our attempt to come to you guys and ask for assistance. Uh, we have noticed over, um, probably the last couple of months that there is, um, what we would classify as

speeding on the ramp. So, speeds in excess of 15 miles per hour. So, before we do anything, rule, regulation, alert list, before we do anything, we are coming to you to say what would you recommend. How do we address this? What would your, what's your guidance?

Bachman: I wonder how many people are really aware. I, I know it's posted on the, the gates and you can't really put a speed sign in the middle of the tarmac, but if we took a vote of hands, how many people actually know it's 15 miles an hour speed limit from the audience and the WAAC?

Korb: I think there's, there's, before you even get to that is, is kind of the, the risk assessment matrix and, and our, is 15 miles an hour actually a reasonable speed everywhere on the airport given some of the distances involved and so forth? Um, I ha, I, I haven't done a study to, to know that but 15 is awfully slow.

Bachman: So –

Korb: **** –

Bachman: – so a risk assessment perhaps?

Williams: Well, I mean we, we could but we, we checked with other airports beforehand to determine what their speeds are, and it found that their speeds are on – we haven't found anyone that's faster than 15 miles per hour or slower.

Korb: Well, I think that the, my recommendation at the outset would be to send out notice, um, to people and maybe even multiple notices to, you know, make sure it gets people's attention –

Williams: Okay.

Korb: – and make sure it's very clear at the outset, um, you know, right at the top –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Korb: – what the notice is about, what the concern is, uh, so people at the very least will be, um, hopefully, you know, cognizant of what the rule is and reminded of –

Williams: Mm hmm.

Randolph: – of what the speed limit is.

Williams: Okay.

Korb: Um, and I think, uh, it may be a good idea to have a discussion down the line about whether it's the appropriate speed limit.

Williams: Okay. So, we will do that.

Ceresa: The number of people speeding, is it one, two, three, five? All of us?

Williams: No. It's not a, it's not all of you. Uh, what we, what we witness is, what – so first of all, just for, for some perspective, as, as you can imagine the airport manager is making it very clear to employees in their trucks if you're doing any speed, you're doing 14. Right? Because we, we, we have, we have to set, set the, set the standard and so you can believe that the employees are sometimes ****, you know, it's

taking me forever to get there, but, you know, we, we cannot take exception. To your question about, we notice that it's, um, nor, not SASOs, so we're not saying it's FBOs. We don't, we don't see that. We do see on occasion people driving onto the field that aren't even tenants, and they're just driving around looking, and they don't have any perspective. They're just looking at airplanes. How they got access, we don't know, but we have, we have had a few that we have had to stop. We have people that do take shortcuts across the transient ramp to and fro, right. When we, when people are coming into pick up passengers, we, we stop them. We have stopped the process of just giving them the code and coming through. We hold them at the gate. Hey, stay here. You know, there's a speed limit, but to your answer, we would say, and I polled the staff most recently, and they get, according to them, vehicles that pass the street sweeper, pass other cars, an average of four or five a week.

Ceresa: Same people or different folks?

Williams: Different folks. We don't have a habitual, there's, it's him. We don't have that, and then when we call 'em out, we're accused of harassing and, you know, why are you picking on me and no, I wasn't going that fast, but when you're sitting in the office, in Alex office, my office, Brenda's office, and you're looking out the window all day, you kinda know what 15 miles an hour looks like, but to that point, look at, knowing what it looks like and knowing what it is is two different things. So, we, we talked to a PD, and they have said well, we come out there and just do some surveying for you with, with Lidar. I don't wanna go that far yet 'cause the first thing it'll be is like now Rayvon's got a speed gun out here on us. Don't wanna do that. That's why I'm coming to you. How do we address this? And so, what we'll do is we'll send out a notice and, uh, we'll monitor it, and we'll advise people to watch their speed.

Randolph: I, I would hope that the objective is to, um, achieve safety not to enforce 15 miles an hour. I think those are not necessarily the same thing.

Williams: Well, the objective is to have safety. Right? And, and if, and if the rule, preponderance of general aviation airports is 15 miles an hour, I would assume that that's a safety-based rule, but if we look at Mr. Porter's perspective, right, and we, we go through this assessment and the number comes out to be 15 miles an hour as a safe rule, as a safe speed then –

Randolph: It, it is undoubtedly the case that the safe speed in a half mile of empty pavement in every direction is not the same safe speed at the corner of three hangars. Right? There's situational differences

–

Williams: Ab, absolutely.

Randolph: – I'm not suggesting we have **** at the airport –

Williams: No, no, no, no, no, no –

Randolph: – I'm not.

Williams: – absolutely. I mean going across a blind corner at 2 miles an hour that makes sense as opposed to 15 but going down a taxi lane at 25 miles an hour, you know, sends a signal that we don't wanna send. Oh, wait a minute, it must be okay, and so we, we have to have some perspective so.

Guerrieri: This speed limit is listed in the regulations?

Williams: And posted on the signs.

Ceresa: I thought you couldn't have a vehicle on the taxi lane.

Williams: No, on the taxiway.

Ceresa: Taxiway.

Williams: Yeah, but we have people on taxiways. We got 'em on cameras without tenants. Just driving on taxiways. We, we've seen that, but that's not the topic.

Ceresa: That's, but that's a different issue –

Williams: That's a different issue.

Ceresa: – there's speeding on a taxiway, it's getting on is the problem.

Williams: Well yeah, you shouldn't be on the taxiway but, but I –

Ceresa: They shouldn't be on airport property.

Williams: Th, that, that's, that's a totally different thing, but anyway, I, we, we appreciate your guidance. I wanted to put it out there. I wanted to daylight it to the community, right, Or, and Orry's saying hey, this is a communi, educational. It's something we picked up, and we just wanna note it and we don't people coming to think it's a heavy-handed action. We, we're just highlighting it. Hey, would you be sensitive to it –

Shelton: I'd like to –

Shelton: – ****.

Shelton: – say something if I could. Um, Joe Shelton. Um, I live in Watsonville and one of the things I've determined since I've lived in Watsonville is that Watsonville drivers are some of the worst in the nation.

WAAC Member: **** New York.

Bachman: **** lived in Texas.

Shelton: No, I've lived in Paris so, you know, I can get you. Um, but one of the things that the Watsonville PD does periodically is they'll bring in highway patrol and officers from other cities to help police the city 'cause it, you know there's a limited number of people and, you know, it's basically saturated for a day and then go away, and what I'm thinking is that if we've got some people that are doing this, you know, just, if instead of you look out the window and say how do we slow 'em down, go talk to that person each time. Have, you know, have your own, your own mini police force that doesn't necessarily write tickets but talks to everybody that you see speeding and, you know, set the expectations for the future I guess is my point; that if you do it next time you'll get cited.

Williams: We, we gotta be real careful with that.

Shelton: I understand but –

Williams: 'Cause we, we have had employees come back to me and tell me that they've been –

Shelton: Give 'em a day –

Williams: – not trea, not, not, not treated in a way that I would expect a pilot to treat someone that services them here on the field and they're just trying to make a livin'.

Shelton: I'll loan you a taser.

Williams: Right, and that, and that is a challenge for me personally, but I digress. Thank you. For your guidance. I'll move on.

Bachman: Can I ask you one question about that, Rayvon, though? So, we have a, a ten, we have a list that people sign up for giving their emails and then you can send an email to them. Do you have every tenant's email, or will this be a, a letter in the mail?

Williams: We're gonna, we, we, we communicate with tenants in, um, via their alert list so we ask everyone to sign up to the email as we'll blast it out. We have everyone's address based on their account. We'll send a letter out to that, and we'll post it on the website.

Bachman: But how many tenants actually sign up for that is my point?

Williams: We s, well, um, we, there are 354 people on the alert list. I don't believe all the tenants are there, right, but we will send out the 200 and, uh, 85 letters?

Aguado: Yeah.

Williams: To everyone that's on account and just noting this.

Bachman: I just wonder if you had everybody's email so.

Williams: We, we, we –

Aguado: We ha, we have most of the tenant's emails unless they don't wanna share but, yeah, for the most part we do.

Williams: Okay. All right. So, thanks for that guidance. We will do that. So, so I appreciate that. Moving on, critical aircraft. I'd like to daylight the following. Um, for, for the longest, going back to the 2008 airport layout plan, the municipal airport had a critical aircraft that was, um, a Cessna 500. Basically, a Citation 1 or a, um, Citation 1 SP. The critical aircraft is the aircraft that the airport configuration is designed for that aircraft's most critical, um, operation, whether it be takeoff or landing. The critical aircraft for an aircraft is, the critical aircraft for an airport is based on a number of attributes that Scott and Marjorie and Joe are going through with the, uh, with our design consultant. It has come to our attention that based on the number of operations that we have that our critical aircraft at the next airport master plan update and layout plan update will be a King Air 350 though it will not be a citation turbo jet. Will not be a jet aircraft. What does that mean? I want to daylight to everyone the fact that by moving to a 350, what this does is it doesn't mean that the runway extension is in jeopardy, but it's priority will be lessened from an FAA perspective. What's even more interesting is at the last master plan public meeting when it was asked what's important to the tenants, the runway extension took second to investing in the current infrastructure at the airport, and that's the first time we've seen that, and that, that's the first time I've seen that in the 10 years I've been at the airport. So, I just wanna make sure that everyone understands that as we go forward the runway extension is still in plan but it's in plan is changing as we go through this process.

Guerrieri: Okay. Can you say a little more about how that critical aircraft is determined?

Williams: Um, in, in simplest terms and, um, Marjorie and Joe and, and, um, and Scott can tell you, it's based on the number of, um, takeoffs and landings that occur on the field. Uh, from 2013 until 2018 we counted every takeoff and landing via camera and sent 'em out to a service and so we got really good at knowing what our numbers are. Uh, when I went to the FAA showing them this thinking that we had good data, I was basically told nice try, Rayvon, but that's the wrong rock. What we really wanted was this, so we took that data and had it re, massaged for aircraft groupings. So, they're looking at not only CJ, 801 CJ or, or, or, uh, or, um, or, um, Mark's, um, CJ out of Well-Pic or, or any jet. They're looking for a group of jets, a group of categories, aircraft design group. We don't have enough operations in that aircraft design group for a jet. We got plenty when it comes to King Air 350s, and so that's, that's, that's the cliff notes version.

Ceresa: We got downgraded.

Williams: We got downgraded.

Ceresa: Mm hmm.

Williams: Okay. Um, airport master plan update. In the summer of 2020 we received, we, we applied for a grant that we were told we were never, we would not get in the fall of 2019. We jumped through all kinda hoops and pulled all kinda strings that we could, did every creative thing we, ca, we could come up with, and even though we were told you'd never get it, we got a grant for \$550,000.00 for a master plan update in the summer of 2020. This was after we had spent 3 years doing runway update, uh, runway rehabs, pappy installations, taxiway installations, signage. Just ho, we got a whole bunch a money and they said we're done with you, but we were able to secure this master plan. The master plan update is 18 months. It started in August of 2020, and we're now coming just past the first year. The master plan is likely to be done next spring. We will have an opportunity to present it to the council, to present the master plan to the council. We can present it to the council, and they can accept it. I'm daylighting to you now that I don't wanna present it to the council to have them to just accept it. We wanna present the master plan to the council and have them adopt it as a formal resolution so it's part of the city documentation that they're committed to. Accepting it is yeah, we got it, but adopting it means that the things in that master plan and that's why it's so important that all of you guys be involved in it is something that the city commits to for the 20-year development of the airport. Well, Rayvon, wh, how are you gonna get 'em to adopt it? We need to institute a CEQA analysis. California Environmental Quality Act. The FAA will not pay for it. It's \$120,000.00, takes 9 months. So, what I'm daylighting to you know is when next spring comes around and you're like hey, is the master plan done and you hear the airport say no, we're taking another 8 months, it's because we're going through the CEQA so that by the fall of 2022 or early 2023 we can come before the council with a document that they adopt, and they're committed to for 20 years. Land swap update. There is still, the land swap is not definitive, but it is still, for lack of a better word, in play.

Bachman: Would you just tell everybody what land swap for people that don't know?

Williams: Sorry. Okay. Yeah. How can no one not know, right?

Bachman: I know.

Williams: But, but it's to Scott's point, everybody needs to be educated. In – full disclosure. In 2012 when I arrived here at the airport, the Safety Zone 5 to the west of the airport was not owned, a, portion of it was not owned by the airport, and Dan Chauvet and I talked about how we could acquire that so that the airport would always own property that was adjacent to the runways. Um, I asked Dan if, um, I told Dan we

can't get revenue, but we can come up with a swap and swap land with Nor, with Brooks and Cramer at that time. They wanted to sell us the property for \$3 million. We didn't have \$3 million. So, w, in working with Dan I said but if we can work out a like-for-like swap then we can own property and no one would ever bid on it, bi, building on it. Um, at that time, the WAAC then was supportive of it. We went to the FAA, and we had a plan, and we said we'd like to do the swap. The FAA rejected it. They rejected it because the land that we were going to swap with them, in an old airport layout plan, had a control tower and hangars on the west part of the field, and they said you have a plan here that we've approved and we're not gonna allow you to swap aeronautical activity just because you want a safety zone. The, the, the request died. Subsequently, the Parachute Landing Facility, uh, came to the field. We were able to go to the FAA and during an airport layout plan update, remove the control tower and put in the Parachute Landing Area. It was approved. Nordic Naturals has come to the city and said hey, we would like to expand our facility. They have already expanded it once, and they wanna expand again. They would prefer to expand to the north, the approaching of Runway 9. They own the property that's in Zone 5. We have said to them hey, we'll swap you the Parachute Landing Facility for Zone 5 because that way we own Zone 5 which was the original discussion with Dan, and you guys can be to the north. The fly in the ointment is if we go back to the FAA with just this agreement, they're gonna reject it unless we have a home for the Parachute Landing Facility. There is a disagreement between the airport and what we believe is the best for our continued operation of safety zone ownership and aeronautical activity, and certain members of the pilot community, who would prefer to say no, leave the Parachute Landing Area where it is and just let them build a building closer to the runway. So, the option is, Parachute Landing Area closer to the runway, building closer to the runway. That discussion is going on. I'll just pause there. Am I, am I accurate so far? Okay. So, and because Marjorie and I are trying to figure out this, and so that's where we are now. It has stalled because we need the flight standards district office to sign off that landing a parachute instead of 1,000 feet from the runway, 600 feet from runway is not a hazard to flight safety. Uh, we were planning on sponsoring that. We, the airport. Nordic, I committed to the WAAC that we would not do it until the city, uh, approved its airport land use compatibility study. I said, okay, we're not gonna do anything until the land use compatibility study is completed. Nordic Naturals went to the city and said, well, we'll do it. We couldn't stop them from going to the **** and paying for a practice jump. They did do that practice jump, and the **** signed off on it. So, where we are now is, we the air, Nordic Naturals is now asking us to go to the FAA and start an in, move from an informal process to a formal process. A formal process is survey, meets and bounds, cost of fence removal, appraisal of the property, the FAA requires that we get either like for like or an advantage in any process. That process has stalled because of the current lawsuits against the city relative to land use planning. So, the update is, the parachute landing opportunity is stalled right now. I mean, um, the land swap opportunity is stalled right now, and I don't know when it's gonna move again. Okay. The last one I have is a, um, quarterly financial update.

Bachman: Uh, excuse me. Could we just have the, the document that I wanted to present about the Nordic Naturals.

Williams: Oh, before.

Bachman: Remember, this was the 2017.

Williams: Is it, um, oh, okay. Sure.

Bachman: So, just to start telling everybody, so we don't waste too much time. Uh, back in, in May 2nd, um, 2016, the city adopted a resolution for a major variance for a reduction in parking requirements for this Nordic Naturals Headquarters property. This was due to the changes in their original plans on the size of the building to be constructed in their second phase of the Nordic Naturals Headquarters. The WAAC nor the WPA were notified of this variance application until May 30th, 2017. So, a whole year later, after the city council had already approved the application. Um, yeah, and so what, what I'm trying to have him bring up

is, it's a letter from the WPA lawyers to the city council just talking about their pull of this, uh, **** what did they call it, they withdrew their appeal. So, this, the variance that they had put in for did not change the footprint or the height of the building that was originally adopted in 2019, but it just increased the size of the building. It required an approval for a reduction in parking spaces. That what, that's what the resolution was about. The WPA filed an appeal of the resolution because the city had failed to notified the WAAC and because the project approval demonstrated the city's willingness to approve projects in the airport safety zones without airport land use planning in the general plan. So, the document that they're gonna bring up. It's dated June 13th, 2017, and this is the letter from the WPA lawyers to the city council. They're just explaining that the WPA withdrew their appeal of the resolution and did not oppose, this is the letter here is the little pointer, move it forward, or do I just have to have you do that, Julian? Oh. Okay. I'm checking that. Okay. So, this letter here, it basically, it's just saying that the WPA, um, is the gonna withdrew, withdraw their appeal, and they, they did not oppose the design review permit after reaching an agreement with Nordic Naturals based on specified terms and conditions. So, if you could roll, scroll down to Page 5. So, this is gonna show you the agreement between Nordic Naturals and the WPA lawyers. Natalie Kurkish was representing them at this time. Uh, one more. One more page. Another page. Another page. So, here's the agreement that Nordic Naturals made with the WPA. No. 4 states, Nordic would ensure that any future Nordic development involving airport safety zones will comply with the city's adopted general plan and airport safety zone policies as amended. Well, the city never adopted airport land use compatibility planning. This project is in Safety Zone 6, and so this is a complete, you know, this agreement here, they're going back on completely now. This letter was sent to the city council so there should be some record of it, but I feel like the current desire to conduct a land swap goes totally against this agreement made between the WPA and Nordic Naturals. I just wanted that one the record. Um, I've presented it to Rayvon a while back, and I hope that, you know, the city council has to approve this land swap eventually. I'm hoping a person's word in black and white means something. So, I just wanted to public and the WAAC to see this document.

Guerrieri: Um, I see something in here that's interesting I'd like to comment on. No. 2, there's an avigation easement. Um, can we get a copy of that? I'd be very interested in reading ****.

Bachman: You know, uh, what we're gonna come up on the, on the meeting pretty soon is a history document that Sarah Chauvet and I have been working on and we'd go through a treasure trove of, of documents. She has boxes in her, in her garage, um, not everything is exactly organized, so I don't even have, uh, Attachment B on here. I, I, Sarah, you don't, do you know that we might have that?

Chauvet: ****.

Bachman: It's there, but we don't know how to find it, but we might find it someday. Um, I suspect the city has it, and we could make a, uh, public documents request.

Guerrieri: Or maybe Nordic Naturals has it, and they'd be willing to -

Bachman: Oh, they'd **** Guy Chandra did not know who the gentleman that signed this was, so obviously, there's a new team on Board.

Guerrieri: Oh.

WAAC Member: Um.

Randolph: Do you have any recollection, Rayvon, of, of reviewing such a navigation **** with **** -

Williams: No. No, no, when, when Marjorie showed me this, it was like, okay. There's a, there was a

side agreement and we, we didn't, we never knew. They never mentioned it to us.

Bachman: Well, actually, this went to, was addressed to the city council via email, mm, I thought it also, attachments, oh, no, I'm sorry. It was just to the city council.

Guerrieri: Oh. **** aren't avigation and easements probably recorded as a public document or something in the, uh, so maybe we could have staff look into that, find it if it's recorded in the county recorder's office or something?

Williams: **** the CDD would be recording it. We don't, the airport **** we don't record the easements.

Guerrieri: Yeah.

Williams: But yeah, we can look –

Guerrieri: Well, the county would, I would think, but –

Williams: I don't, I'm not sure.

Randolph: It, it would, it, it would be pertinent to understand what avigation easements or deed, other deed restrictions exist on both Nordic Naturals proposed swap property as well as, as potentially what we own.

Guerrieri: Right. Especially because we might want to use them more going forward when we approve –

Randolph: Yeah, in, in fact, they're part of the handbook and therefore required.

Guerrieri: Huh. Yeah, are we gonna get training on the handbook? I think I requested that a couple meetings ago, and you said we would.

Williams: The, the handbook?

Guerrieri: Uh, both California and federal regulations regarding, um, airport, um, regulations and, and um, I think the, the handbook that I'm interested in is the FAA one on, um, uh, the airport compliance handbook.

Williams: The 51 **** the 5190.6B –

WAAC Member: ****.

Williams: – 600 pages.

Guerrieri: Yeah, so maybe we need just a –

WAAC Member: ****.

Guerrieri: – just a CliffsNotes version –

Williams: I just –

Guerrieri: – of training.

WAAC Member: Yeah.

Williams: I, I'm, I'm, it's been 10 years, and I'm only halfway through it. So, uh, we, we can, we can talk to, um, yeah. So, Kimley Horn, our, uh, planning consultant, we will reach out to them, and we'll, we'll see what it would cost to do a, uh, CliffsNotes version or as a deep dive as you want into the compliance manual.

Guerrieri: Certainly, aviation easements would be a top, uh, topic, I think.

WAAC Member: ****.

Guerrieri: That I'd like to see.

Bachman: And I, I can send the **** the 2011 handbook that is current today. It's out by the California Division of Aeronautics. Would you guys like that?

Guerrieri: Yeah, so that's the California one.

Bachman: Right.

Guerrieri: And then there's a federal one, too, I think. The federal, um, if you take AIP money, you have to comply with this federal compliance handbook.

Randolph: Well, eh, if, if I'm not miss, maybe I am mistaken, but I think the federal one is, is more about the airport planning, right. The paint markings and, and taxiway standards and things like that. Whereas the California **** Division of Aeronautics ten, tends to come in more with the land use planning.

Guerrieri: The federal **** –

Randolph: Outside the fence.

Guerrieri: – I think covers, like, everything under the sun.

Williams: Yeah, yeah, he's right. He's right. The, the 5190.6B –

Bachman: Yeah.

Williams: – **** is the, it's called the compliance manual. It's what the compliance officers use to determine if someone is outside of the boundary. The reference you're talking about is the airport design criteria document.

WAAC Member: Okay.

Williams: Which does the taxiway. But we'll, we'll, but we will, we will, we will look, we'll take an action. We'll look into it. Start small because it is, it's a lot of stuff. I, one thing I will suggest that you guys do is a document that I sent Marjorie. I had a chance to sit on the advisory committee for the California Aviation System Plan, and they have a chapter in there that takes that entire thing and distills it down and very easy to read, and it's very much focused on land use and planning and it's what maybe 15, 20 pages. I think you would find it very reasonable.

Guerrieri: **** I just make a public statement about a particular part of the compliance handbook that I find very interesting. And that says, by default, any residential use within the airport influence area is by default

an incompatible land use. Uh, so they take a pretty clear stand on that. Um, so that means we can't, you know, build a little apartment in our hanger. Um, it means that really the, the manager's suite in the, uh, self-storage is, by definition, incompatible land use. Um, so I have sort of an issue with that 'cause I think we might be shooting ourselves in the foot 'cause that basically means we can't have anybody living around the airport **** likes the airport. We basically are setting ourselves up for failure by moving in people that, uh, you know, don't use the airport, so, um, I think it might be kinda silly to *** I don't know. I, I'd like to see the FAA maybe revisit that thinking. I think that handbook was writing in 2006.

Williams: Okay.

Guerrieri: In short, I, I mean, I think hanger homes would be a good idea in some of these residential occupied **** airports.

Williams: Any, an, anything else Marjorie?

Bachman: No, I think we're good. So, your –

Williams: Yeah, my fine, my final, my final, um, statement is the quarterly financial update. So, the um, it, it, Watsonville has had a longstanding history of, um, financial challenges relevant to the airport. Um, I've shared this story before, when I joined the airport, um, in 2011 and was speaking with Don French regarding how he managed the airport finances, Don's comment to me was, well, I really don't worry about that, you know, I kinda let downtown, um, the finance people handle it. And I can understand that because there's a lot going on, but coming from this area in my professional career, I had a different perspective. So, uh, Julian, if we can just put that in, um, display mode, so that we can get the best, uh, view of it, I just want to commit to the following. Down at the bottom, the little slide, the little screen at the bottom. No, the one at the bot, down to the bottom, there you go, over to the, the other side. Keep it, **** right there. There you go. Okay, so, so it's our commitment, and, and I have had this data for years, but I have just never had the, taken the opportunity to provide it publicly. So, going forward, every quarter, similar to Wall Street earning announcements, the municipal airport is gonna provide to the WAAC a review of our, uh, revenue performance and expense performance. Right, and with a key on the, um, the **** balance. So, just briefly, you can see that we have a revenue budget. We have an expense budget, we have year to date numbers. We have the, the way the city looks at it is current revenue due, remaining expenses available. So, the, the, they're more than willing to answer any questions, the WAAC or public may have regarding the categories, but let me just use the following analogy to explain to you how the airport finances work. It's extremely similar to your personal finances. You have an income that comes in every month. You have a list of expenses. Most of us have either some type of checking account. The airport has a checking account, but it's lumped in with the city's overall financial, uh, balances. The, the, the airport doesn't have its own, uh, checking account. Every year, we go for, every 2 years, we create an expense budget. That expense budget is appropriated. The airport can spend no, we can spend less than that, but it can't spend anymore. So, the challenge of an enterprise fund is to try to ensure that those revenues exceed expenses, and in the time that I've been here, we have worked diligently to do that, and I, I will share it with Marjorie, dur, under my tenure, we have tracked this, and I can assure you that there have been no funds from the airport that have been absconded by the city or used in the general fund. With that said, show me, and so if, if you go back and look at audited reports going back to 2013, you will see that. What you're seeing here now is, there is revenue that we bring in every quarter. There is expenses that we bring in every quarter. Our goal is, by the end of the year, that we have revenues exceeding expenses. The number at the bottom is the quarter-end fund balance. I did, I did not want that number to be a September number. I wanted that number to be a today number. That's the number today as of this date in time. I mean, that's the last time we checked. So, that's what we have is a fund balance. So, every quarter when we come in, we're gonna show you this so that you can get an idea of the what airport's fund balance is. The key with the fund balance is we do this. We want a fund balance because Brenda, who was the airport accountant, divides

that fund balance into buckets. We need to have a bucket that will allow us to pay for capital expenses. The expenses you see here are operating expenses. Personnel, uh, we have to buy fuel, we have to fix things. We, we do, we do a lot of things, and that's the OPEX. The capital expenses is a separate. So, she has to have a bucket for the capital expenses. Trucks, tractors, anything that's not a recurring budget, and it's long-term. She also takes a portion of that, and she divides it into the ACIP because we have to pay a percentage of the FAA grants. And so that's part of that bucket, and then we have a third part of the bucket that's the, what did we forget. We have to try, there's, there are things that just break that we didn't plan. And so, our challenges we go through is like any business. We try to run it as efficiently as possible. And my commitment to you is to make sure that on a quarterly basis, we report to the WAAC, and report to you what these numbers are. So, this will be a part of the minutes. We'll keep doing it, going forward. If you have any questions about, well, what does that mean or what is that, more than happy to share it with you. But this information is public. It is made available at the city, but I don't think anyone's gonna go looking for it. And so, what I wanna do is go in there and pull it out and share it, so it's completely transparent. And that concludes my report.

Randolph: Rayvon on, on this, is, **** I don't necessarily wanna drag you through it live here, but it might be worth having, as a second page, a key that has, like, you know, top five things in each category or something that gives us a flavor of what, for example, administrative expenses are as distinct from personnel. Right, when, when I see administrative expenses, I'm thinking people working in the office, but obviously that's in personnel. So –

Randolph: ****.

Randolph – I, I'd like to understand what's in each of these, but –

Williams: Sure, sure.

Randolph: – a key that helps me with pie charts or something.

Williams: Yeah, just, just to give you some, some example, we are taxed, uh, administrative expenses. We have to pay for HR, we have to pay for legal, we have to pay for other source, other sources, so those are administrative expenses. Right, so we, we, we don't have our own accounting people. We don't have our own HR.

Randolph: Okay.

Williams: I don't have my own legal team, and so there are expenses. Personnel, that's the people. Expenses. Fuel, we gotta buy. If we sell it, we gotta buy it. Right. Operating expenses. Sam has a budget. That's a, that's a big number, but Sam has a budget for infrastructure, hangers and whatnot. Right, fixing things. He has a budget to send our vehicles down to MSC when they break. Administrative expenses. We have insurance that we have to pay. We have to pay software for the software that the city uses. They tah, every time, where, where **** –

Randolph: The **** –

Randolph: – **** –

Randolph: – the million dollars is a charge the city charges the airport for running the, for assisting you.

Williams: – **** but we, but we can provide that, but I just wanna give you a flavor of it, but it's, it's real, it's real money that we, if you say, well, why can't you do that yourself, I'd love to do it myself. I would love to

have our AR. We could, we could do it, but we only have 300 people. But I can't convince them to give me my own AR. I could do it for a lot cheaper, but that is not the way the system works. Right? They got, people got jobs, and so I don't have a choice. I made that pitch years ago. And it was like, Rayvon, you're not in, you're not over in Cupertino, you're here in Watsonville, it doesn't work that way. So –

Aguado: Scott, Scott, and to, uh, further, um, assist Rayvon, some of the bigger ticket items that go under admin is, like, PG&E, um, legal services, expert and consultation services. Um, a big one is our general insurance. So, stuff like that. It's not necessarily –

Randolph: Gotcha.

Aguado: – just buying stuff at Staples and such stuff. It's, it's bigger than that –

Randolph: Yeah, no I, no I, I didn't figure it was a million dollars' worth –

Aguado: Yeah.

Randolph: – of post its.

Shelton: It would be nice to see, this is Joe Shelton, it would be nice to see over time, this is like a, a snapshot.

Williams: Yes.

Shelton: And it would be nice to, over time, to see how it plays out, so you can go back, and you can understand whether you're getting better or you're getting worse, you know.

Williams: Yeah, what, what you'll find is **** I have for uh, uh, a number of years, done year-end review. When we get ready to go to the end, they'll be a financial component.

Shelton: Okay.

Williams: And there will be graphs and we'll show you how we've ****.

Shelton: Okay.

Guerrieri: When is, this is a fiscal year?

Williams: Our fiscal year starts, this is a, this is the first quarter of the fiscal year that began July 1st.

Guerrieri: Okay.

Randolph: Which, which is why the percent remaining is, his high, right.

Guerrieri: And, well, and that's 75 percent which kind of makes sense for.

Williams: Yeah, no we're on track.

WAAC Member: ****.

Williams: We're, we're on track on revenues. Expenses we, we, we, the expense number, well, wait a

minute, you know, that should be more than 70, but what, what happened was, we got charged full year instead of quarterly for some items. Our, our insurance premium, instead of getting charged just \$5,000.00, they took the whole thing, right, and so, that's why you'll see it, so it, it will level out over time, but that's to Joe's point.

Guerrieri: Just to make that clear, you might wanna put Quarter 1 or something like that.

Williams: We're always willing to improve. Thank you for your time.

Williams: Marjorie?

6.b. Chairperson's Report

1. The Connection Between the Watsonville Pilot's Association and the Watsonville 2030 General Plan

Bachman: Thank you, Rayvon. Um, next I'm gonna do a little report about some of the history with Watsonville Pilot's Association. Julian, if you could bring up my, um, PowerPoint presentation. Ah, thank you, and if you could put it to the display mode like Rayvon had it. Great, thank you. Just, oh, okay, make sure my pointer works. About 3 years ago, Sarah Chauvet and I started compiling a record of the WPA's history. We attempted to create a written document on all the hard work and dedication behind the battles fought by the WPA over the years. Many individuals fought those battles, but Dan Chauvet was an important force behind the organization. Some say he was the soul of the WPA. You even heard his name mentioned tonight during the **** the WAAC meeting. During Dan's aviation career, as many of you know, he worked as the chief pilot for Granite Construction in Watsonville, and he was a beloved flight instructor for many of the pilots on the field. When Dan lost the use of his legs, he put all of his energy into volunteering to keep the Watsonville Municipal Airport successful. Dan served as the Watsonville Pilot's Associations Security of Legal Affairs for many years, and Sarah, like I said, has a treasure trove of documents in her garage that helped us piece together this history. Tonight, I'm gonna focus on the connection between the WPA and the Watsonville General Plan. As many of you know, in 1942, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, precursor to the FAA, began construction of the current Watsonville Airport. The war department leased the Watsonville Airport in 1943 for \$1.00 and established Naval Air Auxiliary Station Watsonville in support of World War II, and in 1948, the Watsonville Airport transferred back to the City of Watsonville at no cost through the 1948 instrument of transfer with the agreement that the property would only be used for public airport purposes. The city has governed the airport ever since. The Watsonville Pilots Association was founded in 1987 to protect and promote general aviation at the Watsonville Airport and to protect the safety of pilots and people on the ground around the airport. The WPA became a 501c3 nonprofit organization under the California Aviation Council, the precursor to Cal Pilots. As you all probably remember, on October 17, 1989, the 6.9 Loma Prieta earthquake devastated central California. Watsonville Municipal Airport served as a major hub for incoming supplies and functional transportation into and out of Santa Cruz County. Local pilots joined together with Cal Pilots to help provide disaster relief supplies to the community. Theresa, you were there. You were one of the helpers. Shortly after the, sorry, shortly after the earthquake, a group of Watsonville citizens in 1990 started a movement to close the airport to build affordable housing on the airport's 344 acres which started decades of conflict between the airport supporters and the airport detractors. In 1994, the city adopted the 2005 general plan which is still in effect today. That same year, the State of California passed a bill requiring that every county have an airport land use commission to oversee land development around airports. Santa Cruz County felt they did not need an ALUC and State Senator Henry Mello succeeded in exempting the county from the state mandate leaving land use around the airport under the city's control. In 2000, the city began developing a new 2030 general plan to incorporate future growth in the Watsonville community. Measure U was on the ballot in 2002 and passed overwhelmingly restricting the city from developing prime farm land and drawing the urban line limit. Measure U guided the city's plans for expanding the city's boundaries into the Buena Vista area where they planned to develop 2,250 new homes. This high-density development just north and west of the airport began pressuring the city to consider closing Runway 0826 and potentially shutting down the entire airfield. The first draft of the 2030 general plan included

closure of Runway 0826. Now during this same time period, Pajaro Valley Unified School District decided they needed to build a new high school, and in 19A considered eight different sites for the location of Pajaro Valley High School. the WPA did not object to building a high school near the airport because of the state and city assurances that Runway 220 would be lengthened by 800 feet to move the safety zones farther southwest away from the high school and also with an installation of an instrument landing system at the airport. Well, in 2002, Pajaro Valley High School was opened, but no runway lengthening or ILS installation occurred as promised. Another issue on the WPA's agenda at the time was the diversion of funds. In 1990, the WPA discovered that the city had been directing all airport revenue into the city general fund not the airport air prize fund with no differentiation or accounting for the airport monies. For many years, the WPA needed to focus a great deal of energy on the diversion issue because proponents of the airport closure claimed that the city totally supported the airport financially and that the airport was not self-sustained, but this is not true. Although this is an interesting topic, it is not pertinent to the general plan issue so I won't go into any further detail tonight. In 2006, the city council passed Resolution 7405 to modify the Watsonville Airport master plan to designate Runway 0826 as a low activity runway. The resolution eliminates Safety Zone 3 and deleted the language to avoid schools, daycare centers, nursing homes and hospitals in Safety Zone 6. Basically, the resolution deviated from the criteria set forth in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook which I will refer to as The Handbook. The Handbook is a document published by the California Division of Aeronautics to identify the requirements and procedures for preparing effective airport land use capability planning documents. Well, on May 23, 2006, the city adopted the Watsonville Vista 2030 General Plan despite warnings from the Division of Aeronautics that the city had not incorporated The Handbook into 2030 general plan. Immediately, the WPA filed a lawsuit against the city to halt the implementation of the 2030 general plan joined by the Friends of Buena Vista, the Sierra Club and eventually the CDOA. The lawsuit addressed the issues of the potential closure of Runway 0826 and building 2,250 houses in the Buena Vista area. I think I might have missed a, I think I did it. Sorry. On March 21, 2008, the Superior Court ruled in favor of the WPA issuing a statement of decision ordering the city to rescind the 2030 General Plan. The court found the city had violated the State Aeronautics Act by failing to adopt the criteria established in the Airport Land Use Planning Handbook and violated the California Environmental Quality Act, the CEQA. The city paid the WPA legal fees. The city disagreed with the court's decision and in June 2008, the city filed an appeal to the Superior Court ruling arguing they had not violated the State Aeronautics Act or CEQA and that The Handbook safety criteria were merely discretionary. After the 2008 Superior Court decision, the State of California hired Meade Hunt to create a Watsonville Municipal Airport Land Use Capability Plan, an ALUCP, for the city. The city declined to accept the Meade Hunt ALUCP because of the city's appeal. Well, on August 5, 2008, the city approved a special use permit for Steve Lawton to build a 43,000 square foot industrial building on a 7-acre parcel adjacent to the airport on Jennings Drive in Safety Zones 2 and 3. The CDOA had warned the city that the Lawton project was a direct violation of the 2008 court decision because no permits should be allowed under the court order, but the city disregarded the CDOA warning due to their appeal with the decision. In September 2008, the WPA filed another lawsuit against the city and this time including Steve Lawton. The case settled out of court, and the city rescinded the Lawton permit. The city paid the court WPA legal fees for the lawsuit, and the case closed on July 22, 2009. On March 15, 2010, the Appeals Court upheld the Superior Court decision of 2008. The appellate decision established the term no procedure county to designate a county which did not have an ALUC, an Airport Land Use Commission, nor had adopted an alternative procedure if no procedure designation requires the effected city to incorporate the most stringent criteria of The Handbook. This means that when a safety zone criteria limits or avoids various developments, a no discretion county like Santa Cruz must prohibit these developments. Well, in the next CDOA handbook that came out in 2011, which of course was after the Appeals Court decision, the CDOA wrote the statutory exemption specifically and for Santa Cruz County. You can read it here. This is right from The Handbook, but basically, the City of Watsonville is now required to include all applicable federal regulations in The Handbook's capability criteria as part of its general and specific plans. In 2012, the city began conducting public hearings on their new revised 2030 general plan, and on January 22, 2013, the city council adopted the revised 2030 general plan which did not comply with the court decisions. WPA, Friends of Buena Vista and the Sierra Club filed another lawsuit against the city on March 8, 2013. The Superior Court ruled on September 12, 2014 that the city had violated the State Aeronautics Act and the CEQA again. The court ordered the city to rescind the revised 2030 general plan and once again incorporate The Handbook into the city's general plan. The city once again paid the WPA legal fees. In mid-2015,

Dan Chauvet and John Randolph presented a document to the city which specified the compatibility planning that needed to be incorporated into the city general plan which followed the 2011 handbook. This document is titled July 14, 2015 General Plan Details and Specifics. They created this document before Meade Hunt by the city and the WPA in 2015 to create an airport land use compatibility plan. Well, as many of you remember, in 2016, the WPA leadership changed drastically with the death of Dan Chauvet, who as I mentioned, served as a legal, the secretary of legal affairs. Mike and Charlene McIntyre, president and secretary, respectfully, moved out of the area. John Randolph, Scott's father, he became very ill and needed to leave – Uh, excuse me, excuse me, excuse me. I'm not there. John Randolph, assistant secretary of legal affairs, continued Dan's work, and John Cowan became the new president of the WPA. Well, in 2000, later in 2016, John Randolph became ill and had to leave the area for some needed treatment. Sarah Chauvet remained as the treasurer and continued working on Dan's behalf. During the next couple of years, the WPA went through a period of transition as the leadership regrouped. This accounts for some of the breakdown of the talks that the WPA had with the city as the city has alluded to as for any of you that attended the city council meeting in September when Ms. Merryman gave her assessment of the general plan. In 2008, the city reached out to the WPA to work with them to incorporate the handbook into the 2005 general plan which was still in place because of the court orders. The current 2005 general plan which the city works under contains no airport land use planning. At the time, the city did not have the funding to create a new general plan, but just for the record, the city met with a WPA representative two times. So, to summarize these conflicts, there have been four WPA lawsuits associated with the city general plan. I've talked about them all, and they're all listed up here. All four cases confirm the city's violations of the State Aeronautics Act and the CEQA by adopting the 2030 general plan. Now, when Sarah and I completed this history project a few months ago, we had outlined a potential process for the city to incorporate the handbook into the 2005 general plan and comply with the court decisions. The city's plans regarding the general plan are very dynamic, and right now, they're changing. But here's what we know for sure: The city has hired Meade Hunt to create the Watsonville Municipal Airport Land Use Element, as they're calling it now, which is just another name for a chapter. This will be incorporated into the general plan, which will reflect the most stringent criteria contained in the handbook. After the city council adopts a new or revised general plan, it must go to the Division of Aeronautics for approval and then back to the Superior Court who has the final approving authority. The court retains jurisdiction over the Watsonville General Plan due to the court decisions. With the court's approval, the city will have complied with the court orders. Until land use planning – excuse me – Until airport land use compatibility planning is incorporated into the general plan in a nondiscretionary manner, no land use permits are to be approved in the airport safety zone, but this has not been the city's practice. We learned at the July 28th WAAC meeting that the city has been approving land use permits in the airport safety zone since 2016 and planned to continue doing so without the handbook incorporated into the general plan. Right now, the WAAC is aware of a self-storage facility waiting for the city council's approval at 70 Nelson Street in Safety Zones 2, 5, and 6. At the August 24th and September 14th city council meetings, the council approved a special use permit authorizing the construction of a 21-townhouse complex on 1.57 acres at 547 Airport Boulevard in Safety Zone 6. And Nordic Naturals has been attempting to complete a land swap with the airport since 2019, as Rayvon discussed earlier, which the city will have to approve. There's a lot more to the history than this, but I wanted to make the WAAC aware of this history document and also anybody in the public that's interested. Does anybody have any questions before we move on to the current state of affairs with the lawsuit? Yes.

Williams: I, I would just like, I would just like to note that when you look at the, um, one through three that are here, one of the things that we've made clear, that the airport has made clear to the WAAC and to the city is, is that when development comes up, we, the airport, are obligated to ensure that the WAAC is made aware, so when you look at these here, I would hope that you would agree that a lot of these were brought to your attention because the airport required that they be brought to your attention.

Bachman: Yes, and I agree with you. One thing that I don't think the WAAC was quite aware of is that we would not be notified of land development in Zone 6. Um, so that's something for the future that we'll have to talk about, um, because Zone 6 basically encompasses the traffic pattern, so you can see, that's all the way up to Green Valley Road. It's a pretty large area.

Williams: Well, well, well, I, I think, one of the, on of the things that I would, in our role, and, and I made this commitment to the advisory committee, when, when, when I first started, was that we were going to do, we, the airport, were going to do everything possible to ensure that there wasn't a view that the city was taking action without the pilots having an opportunity to understand what was going on, so we, we stuck and adeem, agreement with CDD that said anytime there's a development that's going on in Zone 1 through 5, we are gonna tell the WAAC. The reason we did not choose so in 6 is because Zone 6 is not a zone that has restrictions in and around the airport. And at the same time, this, we, we, we –

Randolph: Hang on there.

Williams: Mm hmm.

Randolph: Zone 6, in fact, does have a definition and restrictions associated with it.

Williams: And those restrictions, in the handbook would be?

Randolph: The one I know of off the top of my head is the requirement for an imposition of a navigation easement in the deed for any, any project in that zone.

Williams: I stand corrected. But we, but these are not, Zone 6 is a large area. It is an area that goes –

Randolph: Also, across the street from our hangars.

Williams: No, no, I understand that. But, but, but it's also down by the, the cemetery.

Randolph: All the more reason it's important to get the general plan updated so that it's not –

Williams: I, I, I –

Randolph: – an issue.

Williams: – I, I understand that, but I think, one of, one of the challenges that I think we have as a group. And I'm, I'm just gonna step out and say this now is that if we keep, as a, as, as respective groups, if we keep, as respective groups, being entrenched in a position that is not one that at least tries to come together to figure out how we can work within these parameters, if, if we keep –

Randolph: You, you notice this list has three items on it, not the hundreds that have probably occurred in Zone 6 through these years.

Williams: I under, I, I understand that. I mean, I'm, I'm, I'm trying to bridge a gap, right? And I'm, I'm, I'm trying to use this body of smart individuals who are in a position that they have had tons and tons of work done and trying to figure out a way to get a city who is bound by the east, bound by the north, bound by the south, that has individuals that, that are, that are living in this city that are on the verge of, of having some very, very serious problems of trying to figure out, you know, how, how do we make this work, and I believe that these individuals, the individuals on this board, the individuals that are pilots, have an opportunity to figure out a way that we can work together to, to try to resolve some of these. I, I just believe that's true. And, and so the question is, how, how do we make that happen? Now, I know there's a point on here about the settlement discussion. I wasn't involved in the settlement discussion.

Bachman: No.

Williams: I don't, I don't know where, I don't know where we, where we are on that.

Bachman: ****.

Williams: Okay, all right. All right. But, but I, I, I just want to say that what the airport is trying to do is the airport is trying to step up and say, wait a minute, you know, can we figure out a way that we can work some of this together. And, and I'm trying to make sure that you guys understand that we're not hiding anything.

Bachman: No, and clearly, the airport, the, uh, 547 Airport Boulevard is in Safety Zone 6, and that's why the WAAC was never notified about it. Um, I, I would ask all members, pilot members to, you know, be diligent and, and watch what's going on. Get, get involved and find out what's happening in your community, um, in your, in Wats, if you don't, even if you don't live in Watsonville, what's going on and how it, how it affects the airport. But at, at this point, so this, this was just for education. This wasn't really to, um, go to battle with the city right now about the general plan 'cause we've been doing that, the WAAC's been doing that for a couple years diligently. But I think it, it's really important, every time a new WAAC member joins the WAAC that they're presented with some of this knowledge so they know some of the history 'cause sometimes you join the WAAC and like, oh, that sounds really good, but well, actually, it doesn't sound really good because of some of the history. So I hope, did you, were you guys able to access the supporting documents in the document I sent you?

WAAC Memeber: I was.

Bachman: Okay, because everything, everything here that I've talked about has a reference, um, a written reference. And it's not a, this is not a legal document. This is not, this is a layman's document to just in, inform, and, and keep a history because as people move on, as we get, we're all getting older – hate to tell us – but we're all getting older, and some day, this WAAC's gonna be a whole different group. It's gonna be a whole different group of pilots, and it's good to have all this history documented, so that's what we were trying to do is make a document. But at this time, I'm gonna turn it over to Orry Korb to update us on the current status of the WPA lawsuit –

Guerrieri: Okay, I have a –

Bachman: – with the city. Oh, okay.

Guerrieri: Just a quick comment on, on two of these things, um, because you said, you mentioned something about a settlement agreement, so.

Bachman: Well, well, that's coming up next, and we're not gonna talk about the settlement agreement –

Guerrieri: Oh, that –

Bachman: – but we're gonna talk about –

Guerrieri: – that's part of the lawsuit, right?

Bachman: – the lawsuit, yeah.

Guerrieri: Okay. Um –

Bachman: Because this all happened, you know, since the last WAAC meeting, a lot has happened.

Guerrieri: Right.

Bachman: That you guys need to know about.

Guerrieri: Yeah, and thank you very, very much for putting all this together. This is exactly what I needed. Uh, yeah.

WAAC Member: Thank you, Sarah.

Bachman: It's been a labor of love, so to speak.

Guerrieri: Um, so I did receive a call from the, one of the principals, um, wanting to build the, um, uh, self-storage. Um, and he made a good point, and I, I agree with him, um, that self-storage is probably a pretty good, you know, compatible, uh, land use around an airport. Um, and so I'm interested in, in, um, compromising, like what Rayvon was mentioning, um, so if there's some small noncompliant item there like a, uh, you know, like a manager's facility or something maybe, we can work with an applicant to make something happen that, I mean, self-storage is definitely better than a townhouse complex under Zone 6. Um, I would also wonder if maybe we can ask the city to notify us, um, of all Zone 6 applications just so we can be aware of them, maybe by email or something like that. Um, and then we can decide whether we think it's worthy of discussion, uh, and, uh, and then, um, my final thought is on the Nordic's Natural swap. I'd like to see a more grand land swap. Um, I certainly don't want to give away, I don't, you know, and I noticed it was in the minutes, too. Thank you for putting that in there but, um, that, that, um, we really don't want to give away aeronautical-use land, um, if at all possible. So what I'd like to see maybe in negotiations with Nordic Naturals is an idea that maybe they should consider moving to an entirely different location to expand and that we should find a way to maybe bring all of that Freedom Properties land into a very compatible use with the airport. Um, so maybe that means find a land swap with Freedom Properties, that whole several parcels there, um, and, uh, uh, and bring in somebody who's gonna do compatible land use with the airport. Um, I mean, it's kind of a way-out-there dream, but if you can't dream it, you can't do it, so if there's a will, may, or if there's a, you know, if we have the will, maybe we can find a way to make that property, um, owner or find a property owner that would be interested in having very compatible land use with the airport. Um, and if Nordic Naturals wants to expand, I think the city has other locations where they have, you know, an economic development zone or something like that or a business park that, um, they could maybe perhaps offer as a better location for them to expand than in their current location.

Bachman: I, I think the problem with Nordic Naturals is, it seems to me that they've, they've mentioned to the city that they, their timeframe has moved up. Is that correct? And they, when, when the WAAC was presented in 2019, if you remember, they said, oh, we're not gonna build for 5 years, but now they want to move that up, so my hope is if, if we, I'm hoping if they see that agreement that I presented there, I'm hoping it will get to them.

Williams: I've already sent that to them.

Bachman: I'm hoping that will shame them and hold them off enough, and eventually, they'll run out of time on whatever their timeframe is and just give up 'cause that's what they, what they're saying they're gonna do if, if –

Guerrieri: Yeah.

Bachman: – if we don't meet their timeframe.

Guerrieri: Well, I think, uh, I don't have to use the word shame, if I heard that right, but I, I don't think we should do anything negative. Everything should be trying to satisfy all of our interests in a win-win situ, in a win-win way, right? And so I think a noncompatible land use right next to the airport, if at all possible, should be encouraged to go, um, to a place where they can expand without having hassle all the time. Uh, so, um, I think there may be other locations where, they, well, they even mentioned that, you know, in the original, uh, proposal, I think they said

something like, well, you know, if you guys can't accommodate us, we'll just move to San Diego. Well, we don't want them to move to San Diego. I think there's somewhere, you know, in Watsonville, probably, that they could expand to without having to move to San Diego but maybe not in their current location. So if there's some way we could come up with a deal, maybe some kinda land swap. I mean, I looked around for public property, you know, maybe if we could involve the county or something, maybe there's property that's owned somewhere by either the county or the city that we could find some way to swap 'cause, obviously, it'd be very expensive for us to buy that property.

Bachman: Who, who are you saying we? The WAAC?

Guerrieri: Uh, the –

Bachman: Okay, everybody bring your pennies out.

Guerrieri: – the entire community. Yeah, anybody who's interested, you know? Um, but I don't know, but, um, there's 60 acres of landfill that's no longer gonna be a landfill. Uh, I don't know if there's, how many acres Nordic Natural needs and if there's possible buildable land of that 60 acres. Maybe somebody might, some of it might be buildable, but then you're looking at, you know, um, **** you and, and the next version, but maybe they could be set aside for this one situation or ****. Just trying to think, I mean, just trying to brainstorm of, uh, you know, so maybe there's other people that can brainstorm better.

Bachman: No, those are some good ideas, Dave. Thank you. Anybody else have any comments? Okay, well, right now, I'd like to turn it over to Orry Korb. Orry represents the Watsonville Pilot's Association on the WAAC, and he also serves as the WPA secretary of legal affairs, so he's gonna update us on the current status of the WPA lawsuit with the city right now.

6.c. Update on Watsonville Pilot's Association vs. City of Watsonville Council Lawsuit

Korb: Thanks, Marjorie. Um, some of what I'm going to say, and it's a relatively short statement, um, is repetitious of points already made during Marjorie's presentation, but at this time of night, I can only think in a linear manner, um, and so I'll just follow what I've written. Um, as you know, uh, the City of Watsonville continues to process land use applications for developments within the airport safety zones without having amended its general plan to incorporate the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook despite the court decisions in the two *Watsonville Pilot Association v. City of Watsonville* cases. The WAAC was notified of several pending applications for developments in Safety Zones 1 through 5, and the WPA sent a letter to the city objecting to these proposed land use actions. Unfortunately, the city elected not to notify the WAAC of pending applicants for developments in Safety Zone 6. A diligent member of the WPA reviewing an upcoming city council agenda, which is, by the way, the way to, um, one of the ways that, uh, you can notify yourself of what's going on in the city, uh, this, uh, uh, diligent WPA member, uh, discovered proposed actions approving an application for a market-rate, 21-unit residential townhouse development at 547 Airport Boulevard, which is located directly across from Southern Hangar Rows W through Z. The WPA filed an objection, but the project was, nevertheless, approved by the city council on August 24, 2021. There, thereafter, around September 27th of this year, WPA initiated a court action challenging the approval of the townhouse project. The action claims the city failed to conduct a proper environmental analysis as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, also known as CEQA. That failure stems from the fact that the limited environmental study conducted by the city did not consider the impacts of airport noise and overflights consistent with a nondiscretionary application of the handbook. The action further seeks to enjoin the city from additional land use actions in the safety zones without first complying with the requirements of the State Aeronautics Act, including the adoption into the city's general plan of the handbook to be applied on a nondiscretionary manner. That concludes my, uh, statement about the lawsuit. Um, there has been some mention of settlement. I should just state, um, for the record that under, um, the, the rules, um, concerning CEQA actions, um, parties are required to engage in what's referred to

as an informal settlement, um, uh, process. Uh, so that, that's mandatory, um, whether it can result in any kind of settlement, of course, is anybody's guess at this point. And, um, and what has occurred to, to date is confidential, um, so I can't report on anything, um, including the things I don't know about. Um, so again, that concludes my statement. If anybody has any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer them, so long as they're, they only require linear thinking.

Bachman: Anyone have any questions?

Ceresa: In these lawsuits that have been between the WPA and the city, how much money has the city given in legal fees, or lost in legal fees to the WPA?

Bachman: They haven't given it to the WPA?

Ceresa: No, no, to the –

Bachman: But they've –

Ceresa: – to the lawyers.

Bachman: – they've spent a lot of money. Just put it that way.

Ceresa: As much money as it would take to general, to update the general plan?

Bachman: Um –

Korb: I, I, I don't personally –

Bachman: – could, could be a good guess.

Korb: – know the answer to that question. Um, other might, but, um, there's a, there's a price to be paid for, um, defending an action unsuccessfully. Um, and the city has been a multi-time loser, at least, uh, with regard the, the Pilot's Association lawsuits.

Guerrieri: I, I'd just like to make a comment that we all lose when the city has to pay money. Um, and especially to lawyers, but I mean, these are good lawyers and, but, um, uh, I, I think compromise would be better. So, uh, to Rayvon's point again, um, if we can come up with a win-win situation, we should strive to do our best.

Bachman: Well, I think, like, like Orry said, everything is confidential, but there, there is a movement to work together. That's, that's all I can say.

Guerrieri: Excellent.

Bachman: It's, it's not, we're not, you know, the WPA has obviously been fighting this battle for a long time, only trying to encourage the city to incorporate the handbook. And that is still the objective, but obviously, that hasn't worked by –

Williams: But, but to answer –

WAAC Member: – ****.

Williams: – but to answer Glen's question at that, at the, at a most recent council meeting, the American Rescue Act provided 350, I want to say, billion dollars to, um, cities in the United States. When it came down to Watsonville's share, I believe we have something like 18 million. 1.1 million of that is dedicated to updating the general plan and, and that, and that money's there. So I, I don't have an answer for you relevant to how much the general plan has paid, but I do know that the city is looking at funds to come in and update the general plan and plan to do so in the most expeditious way possible. That's, that's all I know. It's not, it's CDD, and it's, and it, and it's finance. It's not an airport thing, but I, but to your point, I know that there's money coming in to do that.

6. NEW BUSINESS

7.a. Election for WAAC Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Bachman: Okay, we have one more item: new business. So we finally got our bylaws confirmed and signed as of July 28th and so now we have them in effect, so now, we need to follow our bylaws. And one of the things the bylaws calls for which we haven't done before – goodbye Sarah – uh, she was big help on all that. Anyway, the one thing we need to do is have an election at the last meeting of the year for the chairperson and the vice chairperson. So I had indicated, the last time we had an election, that I wasn't sure I was gonna stay on the WAAC, but I felt there were too many important topics coming up that I didn't, you know, I've been on here a long time, and, and I have a lot of the history in my head, so I wanted to stay on. So I'm, I think my term ends in July of 2023 along with Joe. So, um, I have talked with Orry, and Orry and I are both willing to stay as the chairperson and vice chairperson, unless somebody would like to take over. So we probably have to have a motion on, one motion for both, or two motions. Would that be against process –

Guerrieri: I'll –

Bachman: – if we have one –

Guerrieri: – I'll make a motion to elect –

Bachman: – motion?

Guerrieri: – uh, Orry and Marjorie in their present positions to remain in their present positions.

Bachman: All right. Take a vote. All in favor, say aye. Aye. All opposed? Okay, the motion carries. I will remain as the chairperson, and Orry will be the vice chairperson for the remaining year. Thanks to everybody. Thanks again for everybody showing up tonight. We really appreciate your support. Tell everybody how much fun it is to come to a WAAC meeting, all right? We meet the last Wednesday of every quarter. January, April, October – no, no, that's not what, what happened? January, April, July, and October.

Korb: Right. The next scheduled meeting is supposedly January –

Bachman: Oh.

Korb: – 26th, uh –

Bachman: Yes, January 26th, 2022, 7:00 p.m.

WAAC Member: Say hello.

Bachman: Be here. So the meeting is adjourned.

Bachman: Thank you, everyone.

Motion Initiated- Guerrieri Motion- Passed

ADJOURNMENT – at 9:22 PM

The next Committee meeting will be held on January 26, 2021