

**county of ventura**  
DEPARTMENT OF AIRPORTS



555 Airport Way ♦ Camarillo, CA 93010 ♦ (805) 388-4274 ♦ Fax: (805) 388-4366

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT** a Joint Meeting of the Camarillo and Oxnard Airport Authorities will be held on:

Thursday April 8, 1999 7:00 P.M.  
Oxnard Union High School District  
Board Room  
Corner of "K" and 2nd Streets  
Oxnard, California

**AGENDA**

**NOTES** 

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 3/11/99**
- 4. PUBLIC COMMENT - *Agenda Items***

If you wish to speak to the authority on an agenda item, please complete a speaker card indicating the agenda number(s) and hand it to the secretary. Speakers will be called when the item is presented. Comments will be limited to a maximum of **five** minutes per item.

- 5. OLD BUSINESS - none**
- 6. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Oxnard Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The OAA ask the Board of Supervisors to approve the FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study for the Oxnard Airport

*Recall*

Good Evening! My name is Dick Maggio and I am representing the City of Oxnard this evening concerning the ***Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study***. To get right to the point, **and** as I informed the **Aviation Advisory Commission** last Thursday evening, there is conflicting and confusing language in the ***Part 150 Study*** which could lead a reader to think that it is a **plan or program, which it is not**, because it is a **study only**, as correctly reflected in the document title.

As an example of one major conflict within the ***Part 150 Study***, the title of ***Chapter Six*** is ***Noise Compatibility Plan***, but since ***Chapter Six*** really includes **guidelines** that are the outgrowth of the work involved in the ***Study***, the title should be **changed** to reflect that it includes **guidelines only**. A plan will ultimately be prepared entitled ***Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan*** for which the ***Noise Study*** will provide an informational basis.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Authority, I would like to conclude by reviewing a one-page ***Summary of Recommended Actions*** for your consideration.

\* \* \* PASS OUT SUMMARY \* \* \*

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. It is recommended that the *F.A.R. Part 150 Noise Study* be received and filed for future reference by the Ventura County Board of Supervisors—it would not be appropriate to approve the *Noise Study* because a study is not a plan or a program that necessitates approval or denial. ✓
2. It is also recommended that the *Part 150 Noise Study* be received and filed with **clarifications**, as follows:
  - a. *Chapter Six*, which is currently titled the *Noise Compatibility Plan* should have its title changed to *Noise Compatibility Suggested Guidelines* so that it will not be confused with adopted plans or policies included in the *Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan*.
  - b. *Noise Abatement Element*: It is recommended that the *Noise Abatement Element* be considered for approval and that during the next fiscal year alternative departure routes should be evaluated further in relation to measures 6 and 7 as a means of lessening current noise impacts and preventing future impacts. To add emphasis, it is felt that all realistic alternatives should be evaluated concurrently instead of on a piecemeal basis, as is now happening.
  - c. *Land Use Element*: It is recommended that *Land Use Element Measures 2 and 3* be deleted because they could result in a sequence of actions to extend land use controls over the City to solve problems that did not originate in the City in the first place.

d. ***Program Management Element:*** It is recommended that the ***Program Management Element*** be considered for approval, but that the title of ***Measure 2*** should be changed from ***Review Noise Compatibility Plan*** to ***Review Noise Compatibility Suggested Guidelines***. In ***Measure 4*** the title should be changed from ***Update Noise Exposure Maps and Noise Compatibility Program*** to ***Update Noise Exposure Maps and Noise Compatibility Suggested Guidelines***.

**TABLE 6D**  
**Summary of Noise Compatibility Plan, 1999-2018**  
**Oxnard Airport**

Measure	Cost to Airport or Government <sup>1</sup>	Direct Cost to Users <sup>2</sup>	Timing	Lead Responsibility <sup>3</sup>	Potential Funding Sources	City Comment
<b>NOISE ABATEMENT ELEMENT</b>						
1. Continue prohibiting formation takeoffs and landings without prior permission of Director of Airports	None (existing measure)	None (existing measure)	Ongoing	County Department of Airports	N.A.	<b>CONCUR</b>
2. Continue prohibiting touch-and-go's and stop-and-go's between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.	None (existing measure)	None (existing measure)	Ongoing	County Department of Airports	N.A.	<b>CONCUR</b>
3. Continue prohibiting high power engine run-ups for maintenance between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.	None (existing measure)	None (existing measure)	Ongoing	County Department of Airports	N.A.	<b>CONCUR</b>
4. Continue prohibiting Runway 7 departures from midfield intersection (taxiway C).	None (existing measure)	None (existing measure)	Ongoing	County Department of Airports	N.A.	<b>CONCUR</b>
5. Designate Runway 25 as calm wind runway.	Administrative	None	1998	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR</b>
<b>6. Direct southbound departures from Runway 25 by high performance aircraft and aircraft over 12,500 pounds to fly to coastline before turning left.</b>	Administrative	Very small increase in aircraft operating costs	1999	County Department of Airports, Airport Traffic Control Tower	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR in concept, but alternative departure routes should be evaluated further.</b>
<b>7. Request southbound departures from Runway 25 by light aircraft to turn left past the runway end and before the Edison Canal.</b>	Administrative	None	1999	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR in concept, but alternative departure routes should be evaluated further.</b>

**TABLE 6D****Summary of Noise Compatibility Plan, 1999-2018****Oxnard Airport**

Measure	Cost to Airport or Government <sup>1</sup>	Direct Cost to Users <sup>2</sup>	Timing	Lead Responsibility <sup>3</sup>	Potential Funding Sources	City Comment
8. Promote use of NBAA noise abatement departures by jets.	Administrative + \$10,000	Negligible	1999 and ongoing	County Department of Airports	FAA (90%) Capital budget (10%)	<b>CONCUR</b>
9. Promote use of AOPA's "Noise Awareness Steps."	Administrative	Negligible	1999 and ongoing	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR</b>
10. Request Part 36, Stage 2 aircraft to avoid takeoffs after 10:00 p.m. and before 7:00 a.m.	Administrative	Cost of delaying departure or using alternative airport.	1999 and ongoing	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR</b>
11. Request aircraft certificated as creating noise of 84.7 dBA ( $L_{max}$ ) or more on takeoff to avoid use of Airport without prior permission of Director of Airports.	Administrative	Cost of using alternative airport.	1999 and ongoing	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR</b>

**TABLE 6D****Summary of Noise Compatibility Plan, 1999-2018****Oxnard Airport**

Measure	Cost to Airport or Government <sup>1</sup>	Direct Cost to Users <sup>2</sup>	Timing	Lead Responsibility <sup>3</sup>	Potential Funding Sources	City Comment
<b>LAND USE MANAGEMENT ELEMENT</b>						
1. Use combined <b>2003</b> and <b>2018</b> noise contours as basis for noise compatibility planning.	Administrative	None	1999-2000	City of Oxnard Ventura County	Operating budget	<b>DO NOT CONCUR.</b> Using the <b>2003</b> and <b>2018 Noise Contours</b> is arbitrary and nondefensible since the <i>Part 150 Study</i> , <i>Airport Master Plan</i> , and <i>Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan</i> will be reviewed after <b>2003</b> . For the interim period, the <b>2003 Noise Contour</b> should be used.
2. Set <b>60 CNEL</b> as threshold for promoting airport-compatible development.	Administrative	None	1999-2000	City of Oxnard Ventura County	Operating budget	<b>DO NOT CONCUR.</b> There is no requirement to use the <b>60 CNEL Noise Contour</b> so the <b>65 CNEL</b> can be used instead.*
3. Preserve existing airport-compatible land use designations within <b>60 CNEL</b> contour and west to coastline.	None	None	Ongoing	City of Oxnard Ventura County	Operating budget	<b>DO NOT CONCUR.</b> There is no requirement to use the <b>60 CNEL Noise Contour</b> so the <b>65 CNEL</b> can be used instead.* Delete the words "and west to the coastline."

\*It is stated in the *Final EIR* for the *Revised Oxnard Airport Master Plan* that "The accepted federal, state, county, and local threshold of significance for airport noise is 65 CNEL [not 60 CNEL], indicating that all existing land uses are compatible outside of the 65 CNEL contour."

**TABLE 6D****Summary of Noise Compatibility Plan, 1999-2018****Oxnard Airport**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Cost to Airport or Government<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Direct Cost to Users<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Potential Funding Sources</b>	<b>City Comment</b>
4. Establish noise compatibility guidelines for the review of development projects within "compatible land use preservation area" when Land Use Measure 3 cannot be followed, and require fair disclosure agreements and covenants for noise-sensitive uses granted a development permit.	Administrative	None	1999-2000	City of Oxnard Ventura County	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR in concept, but feel that the measure should include reference to the <i>Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan</i>.</b>
5. Offer to buy dwelling units on Little Farms and Teal Club Roads through a voluntary program with homeowners or provide sound insulation.	\$850,000 to \$6,000,000 (depending on options selected by homeowners)	None	2000-2002 (based on available funding)	County Department of Airports	FAA (90%) Capital budget (10%)	<b>CONCUR</b>

**TABLE 6D****Summary of Noise Compatibility Plan, 1999-2018****Oxnard Airport**

Measure	Cost to Airport or Government <sup>1</sup>	Direct Cost to Users <sup>2</sup>	Timing	Lead Responsibility <sup>3</sup>	Potential Funding Sources	City Comment
<b>PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ELEMENT</b>						
1. Maintain and enhance system for receiving, analyzing, and responding to noise complaints.	Administrative	None	Ongoing	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR</b>
2. Review Noise Compatibility Plan implementation	\$180,000 (assumes average of \$30,000 every three years)	None	Ongoing	County Department of Airports	Operating budget	<b>CONCUR with the reservation that the term "Plan" should be changed to "Suggested Guidelines" to be consistent with the revised title of Chapter 6.</b>
3. Publish a pilot guide.	Initial edition: \$5,000  Future editions: \$40,000 (assumes \$8,000 every three years)	None	1999	County Department of Airports	Initial edition: FAA (90%) Operating budget (10%) (already budgeted)  Future editions: Airport operating budget	<b>CONCUR</b>
4. Update Noise Exposure Maps and Noise Compatibility Program	\$450,000 (assumes \$225,000 every 5 to 10 years)	None	Update every 5 to 10 years as needed	County Department of Airports	FAA (90%) Operating budget (10%)	<b>CONCUR with reservations—noise exposure maps just portray averages and people respond to single event noise, not averages. The term "Program" should be changed to "Suggested Guidelines" to be consistent with the revised title of Chapter 6.</b>

**TABLE 6D****Summary of Noise Compatibility Plan, 1999-2018****Oxnard Airport**

Measure	Cost to Airport or Government <sup>1</sup>	Direct Cost to Users <sup>2</sup>	Timing	Lead Responsibility <sup>3</sup>	Potential Funding Sources	City Comment
5. Install noise and flight track monitoring system.	\$25,000	None	2000 (based on available funding)	County Department of Airports	FAA (90%) Operating budget (10%)	<b>CONCUR</b>
			Funding Source	Funding Amount		Funding Percentage
Total Costs and Funding			FAA	\$1,201,500 to \$5,836,500		77-87%
			Airport Capital Budget	\$88,500 to \$603,500		6-9%
			Airport Operating Budget	\$265,000		17-4%
			Total	\$1,555,000 to \$6,705,000		100%

**NOTES:**

N.A. —Not applicable.

<sup>1</sup> Where “administrative” costs are noted, it is expected that the necessary tasks can be handled by existing staff within existing budgets.

<sup>2</sup> Airport users will be indirectly responsible for at least part of County Department of Airports’ share of funding through lease payments and user fees.

<sup>3</sup> Where Ventura County does not have direct responsibility for implementing a given measure, the County Department of Airports will encourage the listed jurisdictions to implement measures as described.