DATE: January 16, 2020, Regular Meeting
TIME: 10:00 AM
PLACE: Board of Supervisors’ Chambers

AGENDA

-- The recommended actions appearing on the agenda are those recommended by staff. The Committee may take other actions relating to the issues as may be determined following consideration of the matter and discussion of the recommended actions.

-- Items that will require action by the Board of Supervisors may be forwarded to a future Board of Supervisors meeting for consideration.

-- Language interpretation services are available. Please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001 no less than three business days prior to the meeting to request an interpreter.

-- Persons wishing to address the Committee on any item on the agenda are requested to complete a Request to Speak Form and give it to the Deputy Clerk so the Chairperson may call speakers to the podium when the item is considered. Request to Speak Forms must be submitted prior to the start of public comment for the desired item, and for items on the Consent Calendar or added to the Consent Calendar, prior to the call for public comment on the Consent Calendar.

-- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Brown Act, those requiring accommodations in this meeting should notify the Clerk of the Board's Office 24 hours prior to the meeting at (408) 299-5001, or TDD (408) 993-8272.

-- To obtain a copy of any supporting document that is available, contact the Office of the Clerk of the Board at (408) 299-5001.

-- Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to all or a majority of the Board of Supervisors (or any other commission, or board or committee) less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board, 70 West Hedding Street, 10th Floor, during normal business hours.

-- Persons wishing to use the County’s systems to present audio/video materials when addressing the Committee must provide the materials to the Office of the Clerk of the Board at least two business days in advance of the meeting. Speakers with audio/video materials must adhere to the same time limits as other speakers and will not be granted additional time to address the Committee. The County does not guarantee the ability to present audio/video material, and the Chairperson may limit or prohibit the use of the County’s systems for the presentation of such material.

COMMUTE ALTERNATIVES: The Board of Supervisors encourages the use of commute alternatives including bicycles, carpooling, and hybrid vehicles. Public transit access is available to and from the County Government Center, 70 West Hedding St., San Jose, California by VTA Light Rail and bus lines 61 and 181. For trip planning information, visit www.vta.org or contact the VTA Customer Service Department at (408) 321-2300.

Opening

1. Call to Order.

2. Public Comment.

This item is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on any matter not on this agenda. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on any item not listed on the agenda should complete a Request to Speak Form and place it in the tray near the podium. The Chairperson will call
individuals to the podium in turn. All Request to Speak Forms must be submitted prior to the start of Public Comment.

Speakers are limited to the following: three minutes if the Chairperson or designee determines that five or fewer persons wish to address the Committee; two minutes if the Chairperson or designee determines that between six and fourteen persons wish to address the Committee; and one minute if the Chairperson or designee determines that fifteen or more person wish to address the Committee.

The law does not permit Committee action or extended discussion on any items not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Committee action is requested, the Committee may place the matter on a future agenda. Statements that require a response may be referred to staff for reply in writing.

3. Approve Consent Calendar and changes to the Committee's Agenda.

   Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be considered at the end of the regular agenda for discussion. The Committee may also add items on the regular agenda to the Consent Calendar.

   Notice to the public: there is no separate discussion of Consent Calendar items, and the recommended actions are voted on in one motion. If an item is approved on the consent vote, the specific action recommended by staff is adopted. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on Consent Calendar items should comment under this item. Each speaker is limited to two minutes total.

### Regular Agenda - Items for Discussion

4. Receive report from the Roads and Airports Department relating to airport compliance findings identified in October 18, 2019 letter from the Federal Aviation Administration. (ID# 99895)

### Consent Calendar

5. Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the construction and funding of a new County Animal Services Center. (ID# 99902)

6. Consider recommendations relating to Supportive Housing System of Care reports. (Office of Supportive Housing) (ID# 99925)

   Possible action:
   
   a. Receive monthly report relating to Supportive Housing System Dashboard.
   b. Receive semi-annual report relating to Homelessness Prevention programs.

7. Approve minutes of the December 19, 2019 Regular Meeting.

### Adjourn

8. Adjourn to the next regular meeting on Thursday, February 20, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose.
DATE: January 16, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Harry Freitas, Director, Roads and Airports
SUBJECT: Response to Federal Aviation Administration October 18, 2019 letter responding to airport compliance

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Roads and Airports Department relating to airport compliance findings identified in October 18, 2019 letter from the Federal Aviation Administration.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal implications to accepting this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the December 19, 2019 HLUET meeting, the Committee requested a report on the County’s response to an October 18, 2019 letter from the Federal Aviation Administration.

Executive Summary
The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) notified the County of nine deficiencies on the airfield at Reid-Hillview Airport. Of the nine, two of the deficiencies have been previously corrected, one has been partially corrected, and one is the responsibility of the FAA.

The remaining five deficiencies are issues of compliance with current standards for signage placement on airfields. The FAA frequently changes standards for airfield signage and acknowledges that airport owners require time to program improvement projects to conform with changing standards. County staff will identify a scope, schedule, and budget to bring the airfield to current standards and submit as a FY2021 budget proposal.

Annual Airport Inspections
Reid-Hillview and San Martin Airports are inspected annually by the State of California, Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics (Caltrans) on behalf of the FAA in what is known as a 5010 Inspection. The purpose of these detailed inspections is to ensure the airports are maintained in a safe manner and to confirm the airports are in compliance with federal and state regulations. There are many aspects of the inspection. Typical areas of inspection include:

- Wind indicators and segmented circle;
- Condition of runways, taxiways and parking ramp;
- Operational condition, color and configuration of lights;
- Condition of signs and compliance with current standards;
- Condition of infield (e.g. mowing and unpaved areas); and
- Height of structures and trees around the airport.

During these inspections, issues, such as, poor pavement condition, infield issues (e.g. ground squirrels), and airspace issues (e.g. trees that have grown into protected airspace) are noted and analyzed. In addition to identifying these compliance and safety issues, the 5010 report is updated. The 5010 report narratively describes the airfield characteristics (pavement size and condition), hours of operations, contact information, radio communication frequencies, and other information. Data from the 5010 report is then used by aviation data suppliers to provide pilots with information about the airport. It is disseminated via various FAA publications, in GPS aviation databases, on paper charts, and many aviation-related websites. It is updated annually and consists of information from all previous 5010 inspections.

On March 21, 2019, an Aviation Safety Officer (ASO) from Caltrans met with airport staff for the annual 5010 Inspection. Airport Operations Staff accompanied the ASO on the inspection and facilitated access to the airport. Following the inspection, the ASO met with the County Airports Director to review the findings and update the 5010 report. On March 29, 2019, Caltrans provided a written letter (attachment 1) documenting the findings.

In addition to the annual state 5010 Inspection, on August 16, 2019 the FAA took the unusual step to send a federal Lead Airport Certification Safety Inspector to RHV. The inspection report that resulted from the visit (attachment 2) identified several of the same concerns as the State inspection in addition to noting grass, ground squirrels and geese as potential issues.

Annual Runway Safety Action Team Meeting
All airports that have Aircraft Traffic Control Towers (ATCT) in the United States also receive an annual Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) meeting. The local ATCT manager conducts a meeting with airport management, the on-airport businesses, and tenants. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss issues that have occurred on the movement area over the previous year. The review includes an analysis of all past runway incursions and excursions which include Vehicle/Pedestrian Deviations (V/PD) and Pilot Deviations (PD). The discussion at the RSAT may include an overview of airport signage, lighting, pavement markings, ATCT communications and terminology, and training techniques used at the airport. This is done to help determine whether the incursions and other events can be linked to the airport’s configuration, ATCT communication, pilot training, airport operation, tenant/business operation, and other issues.

During the annual RSAT meeting, once facts regarding an incident are understood, suggestions are taken by all parties at the meeting and a Runway Safety Action Plan (RSAP) is developed jointly among all participants. This information is then entered into a national database that is used to track the items with the intent of the different organizations involved voluntarily agreeing to take specific actions to improve surface safety. The most recent RSAT meeting at RHV occurred on June 12, 2019. The RSAP from that meeting is attachment.

There can be many reasons for incursions, from human factors like pilot experience, fatigue or confusion, environmental factors such as haze, clouds, and rain, design factors like taxiway width, light colors, or signage and mechanical factors such as brake or light failure. If the cause of the incursion is identified as correctable during the RSAT meeting an action item is created and implemented by the responsible party.

---

1. The movement area consists of runways, taxiways, and other areas of an airport that are used for taxiing, takeoff, and landing of aircraft, exclusive of loading ramps and airport parking areas. (Federal Aviation Administration, 2020)
2. Incursions are defined as any occurrence involving the incorrect presence of an aircraft, vehicle or person on the protected area of a surface designed for landing and takeoff of aircraft.
3. Excursions are defined as when an aircraft veers off or overruns the runway surface while taking off or landing.
4. V/PD is defined as the entry or movement on an airport movement area by a vehicle operator or pedestrian that has not been authorized by air traffic control.
5. A PD is defined by the FAA to be the action of pilot that results in a failure to comply with air traffic control clearance and/or instructions.
Hot Spots

Another outcome of V/PD and PD analysis is the designation by the FAA of a “Hot Spot” on an airport. These hot spots are depicted on the airport diagram produced by the FAA and are determined to be “locations on the airport movement area with a history of potential risk of collision or runway incursion and where heightened attention by pilots and drivers is necessary.” (Federal Aviation Administration, 2019). Currently Reid-Hillview has three hot spots identified by the FAA. These are high-congestion areas and depicted on the official airport diagram as HS1, HS2, and HS3. This information is provided so that all pilots may be more vigilant while transiting these areas.

Safety and Compliance

Throughout these inspections, staff takes safety concerns very seriously. When a safety issue is noted, such as, trees growing into the airspace, immediate action is taken to eliminate that problem. As noted in the staff response to the FAA, the signage issues identified in that letter were previously approved by the FAA and partially paid for with FAA grant funding. Since that time, standards have changed which makes those signs no longer compliant with current standards. It is typical for airports to take some time to catch up with the changing standards as part of planned airport improvements implemented over a period of time.

Advisory Circular 150/5340-18G contains the FAA standards for siting and installation of runway and taxiway signs. In that document, the FAA recognizes that changing standards do not necessitate an immediate change on the airfield. The FAA states “For existing taxiway signs it is not necessary for an airport to take immediate action to conform to paragraph 1.4. An airport can delay implementations until such time the airport undertakes new construction or a rehabilitation project involving taxiway signage” The circular paragraph 1.4 goes on to state “The FAA recommends using the guidelines and standards in this section when developing or revising an airport signage plan, an airport layout plan and for all new development projects. Until such development or revision, existing taxiways not conforming to the guidance below do not need to be changed.”

Airfield Lighting and Signage

Most of the signage on both county airfields is electrified and backlit. Because of the specialized nature of airport signage, there are only a few vendors worldwide. In addition to the concerns with our signage meeting current placement guidelines, the signage is also aging
with replacements parts difficult to find. In September of 2017, at the request of airport management, the airfield electrical system was evaluated by a qualified electrician. The evaluation concluded that the system could be improved or replaced.

Staff has planned a future project to upgrade the airport lighting and signage with FAA grant funding. However, due to the Part 16 complaint filed by the FAA against the County of Santa Clara over skydiving at San Martin Airport, grant funding was not granted for many years, pushing all planned capital projects at the airport back by approximately eight years. An airfield lighting and signage project for Reid-Hillview will be submitted for consideration in the FY2021 County budget. Staff is currently negotiating a service order with a consultant to evaluate the existing system and recommend an appropriate scope for a future project. The project could entail partial improvements or a complete replacement of the airfield lighting system. If the project budget is approved, it will address the compliance issues noted in the October 2019 FAA letter and could be completed in 2021.

![Photograph of Typical RHV Sign with Segmented Circle and Wind Indicator in Background](image)

Responses to October 18, 2019 FAA Letter

The following are an itemized description of each of the nine compliance discrepancies the FAA noted in its October 18, 2019 letter and the County’s response.
**Item 1:** Runway 13L-31R (at the southeast end of the runway): The Runway Exit Sign is non-standard and in a non-standard location. Signs for runway exits are located prior to the runway/taxiway intersection on the side and in the direction to which the airport is expected to exit. This Runway Exit Sign must include the single-letter designation of the applicable taxiway being used to exit the runway, along with one arrow, and be repositioned to a location prior to the exit taxiway.

This situation exists at both the North and South ends of runway 13L-31R. The photo above is of the southern end. **The removal of these signs could be part of a future lighting and signage capital project.**
**Item 2:** Taxiway Z Direction signs are incorrectly located on the west-side of Taxiway Z.

This item was addressed in 2018 as part of the paving project which included new surface painted signage and the removal of non-standard taxiway Z signs. **This compliance issue has been resolved.**

![Taxilane Destination Surface Sign](image1)
![Aerial View of New Surface Signage](image2)

*Map Depicting Location and Vantage Point of Photograph*
**Item 3:** Install Holding Position Signs for Runway 13L on Taxiway E. As indicated by Advisory Circular 150/5340-18G, Runway Holding Position Signs are always placed on the left side of the taxiway as seen by the pilot of an aircraft approaching the runway from the taxiway. Install this sign to the left of the taxiway, in a standard location. Delineate the new boundary of the run-up area with a taxiway edge marking.

The existing location of the holding position sign was chosen due to the physical configuration of the airport. The decision to place the sign at that location considered the distance from the taxiway centerline and the configuration of the run-up area between the two runways.

The standard configuration is for the holding position sign to be on the left side co-located with the hold position markings on the pavement. Due to the physical configuration of the airport, placing the holding position sign in conformance with FAA guidelines would place the sign too far from the aircraft resulting in visibility issues.

Neither of the possible locations for an additional holding position sign meet current FAA standards. **Consequently, airport staff does not agree with this recommendation.** However, this design will be evaluated with any subsequent lighting and signage project.

The run-up area markings were replaced as part of the 2018 paving project and are no longer a concern.
Pilots View of Current Sign with Potential Location of Requested Signage.

Airport Map Showing Vantage Point of Photograph

Aerial view Showing Existing Signage and Potential Locations for New Sign.
**Item 4:** Remove the Runway 31-13 destination sign, located at the right side the runway holding position marking, at Taxiway D. The RSAT recommendation is that the sign is not in a good location because it could distract an aircraft operator or possibly contribute to a runway incursion.

![Runway 31 13 Destination Signs](image1)

**Removal of these signs in not recommend by staff at this time.** There is no indication that these signs have contributed to confusion resulting in a V/PD or PD. These signs are located in an area easily viewed from the visitor parking ramp and add to the situational awareness of pilots unfamiliar with the airport.

![Airport Map Showing Vantage Point of Photograph](image2)

However, relocating these signs away from taxiway D intersections will be evaluated in any future lighting and signage project.
**Item 5:** Remove Taxilane G & F signs located just west of Taxiway Z. The signs are non-standard in appearance and placed in a non-standard location. In addition, these signs are obscuring the view of what appears to be a Taxiway direction sign for Taxiway G.

![View of F and G Signs.](image)

Item 5 consists of two distinct issues. The first is the removal of Taxiway F & G signage. The signs are valuable tools used by pilots; many who are just learning to fly. The signs assist in wayfinding to the Fixed Based Operator area of the airport. However, the design of the signs will be evaluated in a lighting and signage project for the airport.

The second compliance issue relates to sign obstruction. **The second sign was a taxiway Z sign that was removed as part of the 2018 paving project and is no longer an issue.**
**Item 6:** Three helicopter pads located near the self-service fuel pumps, marked on the airport as established heliports, do not meet minimum FAA and State design standards for a designated heliport and must be remove or remarked.

The helicopter parking is located on FBO leasehold property. Staff discussed the inspection results with the master lease holder who agreed to remark the parking spaces. **This compliance issue has been resolved.**
Item 7: The Runway Safety Area prior to the approach ends of Runway 31R and 31L do not meet the minimum design standards described in Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, Airport Design. The RSA for Runway 31R is currently cleared out to 147 feet and 161 feet for Runway 31L.

This issue was analyzed as part of the 2006 RHV master plan update in 2006. The improvement added to the Airport Layout Plan (attachment 4) at that time as a future project. The completion of this large capital project would require a shift of both runways and taxiways to the north by about 100 feet. The plan also calls for a parallel taxiway to be added on the west side of the airport. Planning and construction of this very significant project is not recommended at this time.
**Item 8:** Visual Approach Slope Indicators (VASIs) for 31R are inoperative and were replaced with Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs). Because the VASIs are no longer functional they should be removed as soon as possible.

**Defunct VASI for Runway 13L**

**Airport Map Showing Vantage Point of Photography**

VASIs and PAPIs are navigational aids used by pilots when approaching an airport to land. They have a series of red and white lights visible to pilots and will indicate if the pilot is on an appropriate descent slope. At RHV, those navigational aids are installed, owned, maintained and removed by the FAA. In 2017, the FAA installed new PAPIs for runways 31L and 13L which resulted in the decommission of the VASIs. (The FAA letter incorrectly states the VASIs are for 31R.) However, due to the time lag between installation and certification of the new PAPIs, the contractor could not remove the VASIs at the same time as installing the PAPIs. Staff has requested that the FAA remove the defunct VASIs. **This is an FAA compliance issue.**
Item 9: The segmented circle visual indicator system is missing traffic pattern indicators for Runway 31L/13R

![Current Configuration](image1)

![Future Configuration](image2)

Pilots are trained that when flying into an airport, they are generally expected to fly with the runway to their left. This is called a standard pattern. A segmented circle, which usually includes a windsock in the middle of it, is used by pilots flying into an uncontrolled airport to determine which runway to use – airplanes land into the wind- and on which side of the runway the traffic pattern is located. A segmented circle with no traffic pattern indicator (L shaped blocks in the image above) means that the pilot flies a standard pattern. Because RHV has two runways, the traffic pattern indicator was added for the 31R runway to indicate a non-standard or right-side pattern. During a 5010 inspection, the segmented circle was identified as missing traffic pattern indicators for the 13R runway, and the report recommended adding those indicators, as shown in the Future Configuration image above.

The RHV segmented circle is made up of a paved area with fourteen 12’ x 5’ concrete blocks painted with an alternating red and white pattern. The traffic pattern indicators (circled in red in the above image) are approximately 20’ x 5’ concrete blocks. The addition of these requested indicators will be included in the lighting and signage project for Reid-Hillview Airport.

**BACKGROUND**

On October 18, 2019 Mark McClardy, from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) submitted a letter (attachment 5) to the President of the Board of Supervisors recommending the County accept federal grant funding and pointing out the findings of an airport inspection at Reid-Hillview (RHV). On November 8, 2019 the County staff responded to the FAA letter (attachment 6). At the December 3, 2019 Airports Commission meeting, the commissioners submitted a letter to HLUET (attachment 7) recommending that the County accept federal grant funding as the FAA had proposed. During the HLUET meeting on December 19, 2019 County staff offered to present a report to HULET at its January 2020 meeting with a
detailed response to the nine items cited in the October 2019 FAA letter, in addition to the previously provided response to the FAA.

**CHILD IMPACT**
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

**SENIOR IMPACT**
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**
HLUET will not accept the report.

**STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL**
None

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- Attachment 1: FAA inspection letter 2019 08-27 (PDF)
- Attachment 2: RHV 5010 Inspection Results 2019 03-29 (PDF)
- Attachment 3: RHV RSAP 2019 06-14 (PDF)
- Attachment 4: RHV Airport Layout Plan (JPG)
- Attachment 6: Response to FAA Letter to Joe Simitian 2019 11-08 (PDF)
- Attachment 7: Airport Commission to HLUET letter 2019 12-19 (PDF)
August 27, 2019

Mr. Eric Peterson
Reid-Hillview of Santa Clara County
2500 Cunningham Ave.
San Jose, CA 95148

Dear Mr. Peterson:

On August 16, 2019, site visit was conducted at the Reid-Hillview of Santa Clara County Airport (RHV) with Mr. Abel Tapia. This visit was a follow-up to the June 2019 visit to determine what progress has been made. An airfield inspection was conducted and the following items were noted:

1. Airfield signs, in good condition and disposition, are critical components in maintaining airfield safety and operational efficiency. However, numerous airport signs do not meet standards. Faded sign panels were found throughout the airfield. Delamination is occurring in some of the faded panels. Recommend the airport sponsor develop a Sign Replacement Program to ensure future compliance in the most efficient and cost effective manner. This can be instrumental for the Airport Management in forecasting sign panel maintenance or replacement. By knowing the current condition of each sign panel in a master table, budgeting decisions are quicker and more accurate.

2. Grass was observed in the cracks of Taxiway Yankee. Recommend the airport sponsor chemically treat the grass in order to ensure the continued life of the pavement.

3. Decommissioned visual approach slope indicators (VASI) was observed in the safety areas of Runway 13R/31L and 13L/31R. Precision approach path indicators have been installed. Recommend the airport sponsor work with the San Francisco Airport District Office (SFO ADO) and Tech Ops to have the old VASIs removed.

4. Non-standard signs with a single arrow were observed at the approach and departure end of Runway 13L. The sign does not include a destination and should be removed. All
signs should be in accordance with Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5340-18, *Standards for Airport Sign Systems*.

5. Ground squirrel holes were observed along the safety area of Taxiway Yankee. Recommend the airport operator fill the holes to ensure each safety area is cleared and graded, and have no potentially hazardous ruts, humps, depressions, or other surface variations.

6. Canada geese droppings were found at the approach end of Runway 13R. Canada geese represents a significant hazard to the flying public. Geese constitute a particular hazard because of their flocking nature, large body size and attraction to extensive open landscapes of short managed grassland at airports. Airports can minimize goose strikes by managing habitats within the airport property, applying deterrents to scare geese away and lethal control, but goose migration and movements at greater spatial scales present greater challenges. Habitat management outside of airports can locally reduce goose attractiveness of peripheral areas, but requires stakeholder involvement and coordination. Recommend the airport sponsor take immediate action to reduce the potential for airstrikes with Canada geese around Reid-Hillview.

7. Grass was found obscuring Taxiways Bravo and Charlie exit signs on Runway 13L/31R and Taxiway Golf direction sign along Taxiway Zulu. Grass was also obscuring two no entry signs along Runway 13R/31L, indicating that entry into a particular area is prohibited to aircraft. Signs should be visible in such a way they provide the pilot or vehicle driver the ability to easily identify routes toward a desired destination. Recommend the airport sponsor mow the grass to ensure all signs are visible.
8. A non-standard inbound destination sign indicating PARKING was found on the back side of a mandatory holding position sign at Taxiway Bravo. A surface painted inbound destination sign indicating RAMP was found on Taxiway Yankee. In accordance with AC 150/5340-18, Standards for Airport Sign Systems, sign inscriptions should be consistent; do not use two different inscriptions for the same area (e.g. RAMP and APRON). Recommend the airport sponsor remove the inbound destination PARKING sign panel and replace it with a direction sign indicating Taxiway Charlie since there is no prior indication of the taxiway leading out of the intersection. The sign should have black inscriptions on a yellow background and contain arrows.

Please advise Mr. Abel Tapia at abel.tapia@faa.gov or 1000 Marina Blvd, Suite 220 Brisbane, CA 94005-1863 by return of this letter when the above are corrected.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Jones
Lead, Airport Certification Safety Inspector
FAA Western Pacific Region
March 29, 2019

Mr. Eric Peterson, Director of Airports
Santa Clara County Airports
25 Cunningham Avenue
San Jose, CA 95148-1001

Dear Mr. Peterson:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics, conducted a State permit compliance inspection and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Master Record (5010-1) update at the Reid-Hillview Airport of Santa Clara County (FAA Site No. 02203.*A) on March 21, 2019. We appreciate the assistance and cooperation provided during the inspection. The updated information will be entered into our records.

Our inspection revealed the following items, which we bring to your attention:

1. The three helicopter pads located near the self-service fuel pumps, marked on the airport as established heliports, do not meet the minimum FAA and State design standards for a designated heliport and must be removed or remarked. We understand there are no plans to establish a heliport meeting minimum design safety standards and having an approved approach and departure course at this location. However, if you plan to operate these helicopter pads as helicopter parking positions they must be properly marked and meet minimum design safety standards contained in FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5390-2C, Heliport Design. Helicopter parking positions are identified by a continuous six-inch solid yellow line defining the rotor diameter of a circle, or a square designed to be large enough to accommodate the rotor diameter of the largest helicopter that will park at these locations. Additionally, the helicopter parking separation should be no less than ten feet between the arcs generated by the tail rotor. We have enclosed a diagram and excerpt that depicts the layout and dimensions of the markings. Please contact me if you need assistance with the required marking. This is a repeat item.

2. Continue with your efforts to eradicate gopher holes in the RSA along both sides of Runway13L/31R and 13R/31L. The Runway Safety Area for your airport extends 240 feet beyond each end of each runway and 60 feet either side of each runway centerline. This is an ongoing project as discussed, and we support your efforts to reduce or eliminate new and existing potential hazards.

3. The Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs) for 31R are inactive and have been replaced with active Visual Approach Path Indicators. Because the PAPIs are no longer functional they should be removed as soon as possible.

We recommend the county include the following items in future airport improvement projects to meet current FAA airport design standards:

*Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability*
The Runway 13L/31R and Runway 13R/31L end lights must be changed from groups of three, signifying visual operations, to groups of four, signifying instrument operations in accordance with FAA AC 150/5340-30H, Design and Installation Details for Airport Visual Aids. This change is based upon the FAA approved non-precision GPS Instrument Approach Procedures for both runways currently in place.

The segmented circle visual indicator system is missing traffic pattern indicators for Runway 31L/13R. When there is a variation from the normal left-hand pattern traffic, pattern indicators (arranged in pairs in conjunction with landing strip indicators) are required for compliance with Title 14 Code of FAR Part 91, General Operating and Flight Rules and FAA AC 150/5340-5C, Segmented Circle Airport Marker System. Please add this project to one of your upcoming airport improvement projects, refer to FAA AC 150/5340-5C for the general requirements, and add the traffic pattern indicators for Runway 31L/13R.

The RSA prior to the approach ends of Runway 31R and 31L do not meet the minimum design standards described in FAA AC 150/5300-13A, Airport Design. The RSA for Runway 31R is currently cleared out to 147 feet and 161 feet for Runway 31L. The minimum FAA design standards for your airport require that a compacted, level, flush-to-grade surface, at least 120 feet wide (60 feet either side of the runway centerline) and 240 feet beyond the runway threshold is to be established and maintained to enhance operational safety should an aircraft land short, overshoot, or exit the runway.

It is Caltrans' objective to ensure that airports meet all current applicable FAA minimum design safety standards and FAA AC criteria, Federal Aviation Regulations, the California Public Utilities Code, section 21001 et seq., the California Code of Regulations, Title 21, sections 3525-3560, and all required conditions depicted in the State Airport Permit issued by Caltrans. All referenced publications in this letter, including many FAA ACs, may be found on our website at www.dot.ca.gov/aeronautics.

We are pleased to support and assist you in enhancing safety and utility at your airport and look forward to continuing a cooperative relationship with the county of Santa Clara. If you have questions or require assistance, please contact me at (916) 654-5174 or via email at don.haug@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. HAUG
Aviation Safety Officer

Enclosure

c: Mr. Able Tapia, FAA, SFO ADO

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability."
Photograph 1

Location of three helicopter pads

Photograph 2

Missing traffic pattern indicators for Runway 13R/31L

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
Runway Safety Action Plan

Reid-Hillview Airport
(RHV)
San Jose, CA

14 June 2019

Approved by: _________________ Date: _________________

Greg Garcia
Air Traffic Manager, Reid-Hillview ATCT

The LRSAT chairperson is the ATCT manager or designee and they approve the RSAP by signing this document.

JOSEPH M SANTORO
Digitally signed by JOSEPH M.
SANTORO
2019.11.12 15:31:08 -06'00'

Accepted by: _________________ Date: _________________

Joe Santoro
Runway Safety Program Manager, Western-Pacific Reagion
I. Introduction

A. General Description of the Airport

- FAA Tower
- Tower Hours of Operation: 0700-2200L
- FAR Part 139 Airport: No
- Airport Hot Spot: Yes
- Line Up and Wait (LUAW): Yes
- Multiple Runway crossings: No
- Flight Training: Yes

II. Historical Information / Event History
The previous Runway Safety Action Team Meeting was held on 12 June 2019.

A. OPSNET (12 month count)

Total airport operations for the 12-month period prior to the Runway Safety Action Team meeting, from June 2018 through May 2019.

**ATADS: Tower Operations: Standard Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFR Risenad</th>
<th>IFR Overflight</th>
<th>VFR Risenad</th>
<th>VFR Overflight</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Carrier</td>
<td>Air General Aviation</td>
<td>Milt Total</td>
<td>Air Carrier</td>
<td>Air General Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Air Traffic Activity System (ATADS).

Previous year count June 2017 through May 2019: 169,428  (15.537 increase in operations, 9%)
B. Surface Events since last RSAT meeting

Runway Incursions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/31/19</td>
<td>Aircraft Incursion</td>
<td>After landing Rwy 31L, N55JD was instructed to hold short of Rwy 31R with a correct readback. N55JD was observed crossing Rwy 31R at echo as N3724H (BE76) was departing 31R. At the time N55JD started his crossing, N3724H had already rotated and was airborne near Twy C. N3724H appeared to make a slight right turn on departure. From the tower it did not appear that an oversight occurred. GC taxied N55JD to parking and asked him to call the tower. The brasher warning was given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/19</td>
<td>Aircraft Incursion</td>
<td>At 1419Z, N3492X silently taxied to runway 31R via Twy Z and after one minute in the run-up, departed 31R. Attempts made to establish contact included reaching out on both ground and local frequencies, using a red light gun signal, and rapidly turning the runway lights on and off. RHV tagged up N92X target as traffic and soon afterward RHV received a call from NCT saying that they were in contact with N92X. We asked NCT to pass on a brasher warning with our phone number and they agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/19</td>
<td>Vehicle, Incursion</td>
<td>NGF6565 received release for an IFR dep on 31R. On dep roll, an unknown contractor vehicle for Sunpower proceeded onto Twy E, crossing 31R, and onto 31L without receiving clearance or initiating any two-way radio communication. Both ground and local control reached out to the vehicle to establish communication and stop him. No communication was made. The light gun was also attempted without success. After crossing, vehicle stopped by the solar panels on the west side of Rwy 31L. Arpt Ops was advad and assisted in making contact with the vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/19</td>
<td>Aircraft Incursion</td>
<td>At approx. 2347Z, N446SP exited transient parking and entered Twy Z taxiing to runway 31R. Multiple attempts to reach out to N6SP were made on both ground and local frequencies. After arriving in the 31R run-up, N6SP appeared to sit still and complete a run-up. Minutes later, N6SP reached out to local control ready for departure and was told to contact guard. N6SP called up ground control and received the brasher warning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/18</td>
<td>Vehicle, Incursion</td>
<td>A civilian vehicle crashed through the airport fence near the Runway 31R run-up area causing debris to enter the run-up area. No known injuries or damage to any aircraft. Airport Ops and San Jose Police department were notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/18</td>
<td>Vehicle, Incursion</td>
<td>N550rx, in the Rwy 31R run-up area, reported a vehicle crashed through the airport perimeter fence. The pilot did not witness the event. The vehicle came to rest just inside the airport property. The vehicle had been observed by tower personnel prior to the pilot report. From the tower vantage point, the vehicle appeared parked outside of the perimeter fence. It is common for vehicles to park in this area to view airport activity. San Jose Police and Airport Ops notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/18</td>
<td>Pedestrian Incursion</td>
<td>As N98485 departed, he reported a pedestrian running behind his aircraft eastbound towards Capitol Cxpy. Airport Ops and SJC PD notified. There were no other reports or visuals of the pedestrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/18</td>
<td>Vehicle, Incursion</td>
<td>Airport vehicles proceeded across Rwy 31R @ Twy E without clearance and placed barriers on the runway and taxiway. Airport 2 called GC to advise they were exiting at B. Aft on 1/2 mile final was sent around and the vehicles then exited the Rwy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Surface Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/4/18</td>
<td>Laser event</td>
<td>Acft flying local pattern reported laser light shining at him while on base leg for Rwy 13L. SJF police notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/18</td>
<td>UAS event</td>
<td>Unverified report by an aircraft. Either a balloon or UAS. Unable to get a visual confirmation from tower or other aircraft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/18</td>
<td>UAS event</td>
<td>Airport ops spotted a UAS hovering about 500 ft above and east of Rwy 31R at 4prox. 10:51 am local. Jnct capitol expwy and Row F. Arpt Ops coordinated with the tower to close the Rwy. Rwy closed at 4prox. 10:51 am local. N22131T had just departed Rwy 31R on a right downwind dep. N23131T was given traffic. UAS traffic was no factor for departing acft. UAS departed to the east and Arpt Ops reopened the Rwy at 4prox. 11:05 am. Arpt Ops and San Jose Police located the UAS and operator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/18</td>
<td>Bird Strike</td>
<td>While on a climb out from a missed approach, the pilot informed the local controller that the aircraft had struck a bird three quarters down the Rwy. He requested to continue in the traffic pattern for a full stop landing. No additional services requested. The acft landed without incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/18</td>
<td>Bird Strike</td>
<td>N65658 was conducting a touch and go operation on Rwy 31R, while departing the pilot reported striking a bird with the front nose landing gear near the departure end of the rwy. The pilot did not request additional assistance nor did they report any damage, the aircraft landed without incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/18</td>
<td>Aircraft assistance</td>
<td>Acft was departing Rwy 31R and got a flat tire on departure roll. Acft slowed and exited Rwy 31R at Twy E. Acft was not able to cross the hold short bars. SJF ATCT and NCT adviz. Arpt Ops called to assist in moving acft and fod check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/18</td>
<td>Aircraft assistance</td>
<td>N5093K departed Runway 31R. In the upwind the aircraft reported a mag failure and requested to come back and land Runway 13R. The controller issued the current wind and altimeter and cleared N5093K to land any runway. Arpt Ops adviz for possible assistance. N5093K landed Runway 13R and taxied to parking without incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/18</td>
<td>Aircraft assistance</td>
<td>N49120 engine quit after landing on Rwy 31R. Pilot was unable to restart the aircraft. Aircraft was towed the movement area by Airport Ops. No other aircraft impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/18</td>
<td>Aircraft assistance</td>
<td>N291GT departed RHV to SNS at 1653Z. NCT Togo sector notified RHV ATCT N291GT declared an emergency returning to RHV. The pilot stated he had an oil pressure loss. Aircraft landed Rwy 31L without incident at 1702Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/18</td>
<td>Aircraft assistance</td>
<td>N37Y called inbound from the south with a landing gear concern. When N37Y was in sight on final. The tower team observed the gear up and advised the pilot. N37Y made a low pass so the tower could get a better look. N37Y then went around and advised he would be flying downwind to land crank his gear down. N37Y then proceeded on another low approach for tower to check the gear. LC1 advised N37Y the gear appeared down and in place. N37Y landed without incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/18</td>
<td>Aircraft assistance</td>
<td>After landing roll, N238LP attempted to exit Rwy31L at Twy D. The pilot informed tower he had a flat nose gear and was unable to exit the runway. Airport Ops was notified and toed the aircraft clear of the runway at 1850Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/18</td>
<td>UAS incident</td>
<td>At 0235Z, LC1 observed an unauthorized black quadcopter 1/4 mile south of RHV tower at approximately 500 feet. No aircraft involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RUNWAY SAFETY ACTION PLAN - RHV ATCT

| 6/13/18  | UAS incident | While in left downwind approaching left base for Rwys 31L, N3151E reported a white drone in their vicinity at 1,000 ft. No other aircraft involved, no damage reported. |

### Runway Excursions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/30/19</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>N24991 rolled into the grass infield after landing on 31L. Pilot taxied to parking without incident. No injuries or aircraft damage reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/19</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>While N9091L was on landing roll, the acft tried to exit Rwys 31R at Twy C. Acft was going too fast and spun out in the grass area between Twys Y and Z. Airport Ops reported possible left main damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/18</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>N122EA landed Rwys 31R and exited the Rwys at Twy E. After exiting, the acft's left brake failed and the acft exited Twy E into the grassy area bwn Rwys 31R and Twy Y. Acft reported no personal injury; acft sustained a prop strike and damaged an airport sign. Acft damage reported as minor. Airport Ops notified and provided assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/18</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>N5842Q reported a flat tire on roll out on 31R. He veered slightly off 31R. No injuries reported. 31R temporarily unusable while Airport Ops removed the disabled aircraft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/18</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>N78119 was intending to depart Rwys 31R. Shortly after beginning takeoff roll the aircraft swerved off the Rwys to the left and came to a stop between Rwys 31R and 31L. N78119 did not hit any equipment and according to Airport Ops did not sustain any damage. The aircraft stopped approximately 250 feet from the point were the takeoff roll began as was never airborne. Airport Ops pushed the aircraft on Rwys 31L and escorted the aircraft clear of all movement areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Meeting Overview

RHV Air Operations Supervisor, Greg Garcia, opened the meeting and welcomed participants. Participants included the Santa Clara County Airports Manager, Eric Peterson, and the RHV Local Safety Council Team member Staci Sandidge. Additional participants made introductions.

The team discussed the RSAT process, statistics, incident overview and local and local emphasis items. The presentation served as talking points and initiated discussion among the team members in a number of areas.

A number of surface events and runway incursions have occurred at RHV since the last LRSAT meeting. Multiple factors were identified. Training, human factors, and availability of external resources were identified and discussed. Corrective steps were discussed. The participants agreed to continue education for pilots and the partnership between Runway Safety, RHV ATCT, and RHV Airport Operations to identify issues as early as possible. The recent events involving an unescorted contractor servicing the Solar panel array, the Airport Ops vehicle entering the runway without a clearance, coordinating a better moving schedule and increase Airport Ops presence were key focus items.

In May 2019, a contractor was granted access to airport property by an unidentified individual using their airport access card at the main entrance. The contractor then proceeded from the ramp area to Twy E and crossed both runways (westbound) while an aircraft was departing runway 31R. The tower made multiple attempts to initiate radio communication and provide instructions to the vehicle without success. This incident occurred while an aircraft was cleared for an operation on the runway.
Locally, Airport Operations has taken action to address airport security, awareness of contractors requesting access to the airport, Operations workers training and ensuring coordination with the Control Tower when movement areas may be affected. An external contributing factor identified was the County’s administrative structure which limits communication and coordination of airport contractors through a different county department.

The incident with the Airport Ops vehicle has been addressed by Airport Operations with increased Airport Operations personnel movement area and radio communications training. The tower has briefed the controllers on scanning priorities. The tower has observed a noticeable improvement in the responsiveness of Airport Operations personnel.

Coordination for mowing operations were also discussed. The Tower identified problems in scheduling mowing operations. It is not uncommon for Airport Operations to request to close a runway during peak traffic hours for mowing operations. This affects the towers ability to work traffic and adds exposure to safety events involving personnel working on or near runways. The Tower suggested mowing operations be planned prior to 9am or after 7pm to minimize risk and to minimize impact to operations. This would require that Airport Ops extend their staffing hours to pre-2011 levels when Airport Ops were present from 7am-10pm.

Airport Operations is a valuable airport resource that significantly improves safety and the ability to respond to situations in which aircraft may need assistance. There have been at least 6 events in the past year where Airport Ops have assisted aircraft. Airport Operations discussed parameters they use to conduct mowing which include maximum temperature, humidity and wind limits. The limits concern safety of personnel and reducing the risk of fire. Planning early morning mowing before 8am has mutually agreed upon benefits, however, Airport Operations is limited by the external assignment of resources (county approved funding and unwillingness to accept FAA funding that could free up the budget for staff) to schedule Airport Operations personnel for additional work hours.

Runway resurfacing and painting improvements were discussed and it was mutually agreed upon that the improvements have assisted preventing wrong surface landings. There is an added benefit of less asphalt FOD on the runway due to the improved surface conditions. This saves time and expense for Ops personnel and contractor sweeping the runways. Previous year’s LRSAT discussed runway resurfacing. Now that it has been completed, we have received a great deal of positive feedback from users and we have seen a steady increase in airport operations.

The airport resurfacing and repainting project is complete and the Action Item is closed.

The runway improvements have taken a long time to complete and we look forward to future improvements to signage, lighting and possibly returning Airport Operations staffing hours to pre-2011 when Airport Operations staff was the same as the control tower.

Air Traffic explained the desire of the Tower to provide more pilot education, familiarization, and tours to increase communication and understanding between controllers and pilots. This will improve critical aircraft operations of exiting the runways, understanding taxi instructions and ensuring read backs in an effort to reduce the number of Runway Incursions and Surface Incidents. Air traffic continues to reach out, increase awareness and build relationships with Airport Operations and the pilot community through local meetings and visits.

Participants were thanked for attending the meeting and the meeting was adjourned.
IV. Action Items

Review of Previous Action Items

Open Action Items:

Action Item Code: RHV-2013-001

Action Item Rationale: Aircraft operators commented on the lack of taxiway lights or reflectors on Taxiway Zulu and Air Traffic suggested the County should investigate installing runway guard lights on Runway 13L/31R.

Action Item: The County agreed to investigate the feasibility of making these improvement and report back to the LRSAT by the next LRSAT meeting.

Status Update: The airport repaving project has made a significant improvement to the quality of the airport movement area surfaces and to safety. Aircraft operators continue to comment on the lack of taxiway lights on Taxiway Z as an ongoing safety issue. The Santa Clara County Supervisors recently voted not to accept FAA grants for any improvements and to investigate options to close the airport in 2031.

Previous ECD unchanged: 12/30/2021 (estimated)

Point of Contact: Reid-Hillview Airport, SCCA Manager

Action Item Code: RHV-2015-001

Action Item Rationale: Reid-Hillview has many taxiways that lead directly to the runway from the ramp without any 90 degree turns. Airports Division Office commented on need for a Geometry study to address non-standard conditions at the airport according to AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design AC.

Action Item: The County agreed to complete a Geometry study before any major construction projects. Taxiway signage plan expected from Airport Operations.

Status Update: No update. Item not discussed. External support from County Supervisors to accept FAA grants is not provided.

Previous Status Update: The item remains open for future airport projects.

Point of Contact: Reid-Hillview Airport, SCCA Manager

Revised ECD: 6/12/2020
Closed Action Items:
None

Effectiveness of completed action item: N/A

Runway safety concerns, issues, or problems

A. Airport Geometry – Taxiway lighting on taxiway Z would improve safety.

B. Hot Spots – The published hot spots remain in place.

C. Construction Discussion – The airport has completed the resurfacing project and we look forward to future signage and lighting improvements.

D. Surface safety issues – Airport initiative to support safety have had noticeable results. We plan to have another LSC meeting by January 2020 to discuss an update to the FAA/Airport LOA. Airport Operations is a valuable resource, which has assisted aircraft on multiple occasions. Expanded hours for staff would greatly improve airport safety.

E. Weather – None

F. Vehicles – Recent training for vehicle operations has improved safety. We will further discuss better ways and times to schedule airport mowing activities to minimize impact to aircraft operations and to increase safety.

G. Wildlife – Include in the updated LOA provisions to communicate with the tower prior to bird abatement activities. There was one incident where there was no communication prior to abating birds on the airport which did not take aircraft operations into consideration.


I. Special Events – Airport Day 2020 TBD

J. Feedback – Users concerned with lack of taxiway lighting on taxiway Z and better signage.

K. Other – N/A
V. Best Practices – Air Traffic will continue outreach to local FBOs and users to help educate current and future pilots on issues that affect our facility in conjunction with the LSC team.

VI. New Action Items

Action Item Code: RHV-2019-001

Action Item: Review and update the FAA/Airport LOA to address mowing activities.

Action Item Rationale: Reduce risk of personnel and vehicles on the movement areas during known peak traffic hours.

Estimated Completion Date: 06/30/2020

POC Organization: RHV ATCT & RHV Airport Operations

POC name: Greg Garcia
POC phone: (408) 272-7014

POC name: Eric Peterson
POC phone: (408) 591-9549
VII. Recommendations

Proposed action items where consensus is not reached and/or the action office is not willing to accept the item may be documented as recommendations at the discretion of the RSPM or ATCT manager.
## VIII. List of participants, their affiliation, and email contact information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Garcia</td>
<td>RHV ATCT ATM</td>
<td>(408) 272-5917</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Greg.garcia@faa.gov">Greg.garcia@faa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staci Sandidge</td>
<td>RHV FacRep</td>
<td>(408) 272-7014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Peterson</td>
<td>Dir of County Airports</td>
<td>(408) 591-9549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femi Odunbaku</td>
<td>Airport Operations Mgr</td>
<td>(408) 918-7707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Hurtado</td>
<td>Airport Operations</td>
<td>(408) 343-9919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 18, 2019

Joe Simitian  
President  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Santa Clara  
70 West Hedding Street  
East Wing, 10th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110

Dear Supervisor Simitian:

It is the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) understanding that the Santa Clara County (County) Board of Supervisors (Board) has publicly announced plans to close the Reid-Hillview Airport (RHV) and would like to use the land for low income housing. It is also our understanding that the Board voted to no longer accept Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant funding for needed airport infrastructure projects at RHV. The purpose of this letter is fourfold:

1. To clearly articulate the FAA’s objection to the Board closing RHV,
2. To convey federal obligations the Board must consider with respect to RHV,
3. To notify the Board of the FAA’s safety concerns associated with respect to RHV airfield conditions,
4. To encourage the Board to reconsider requesting AIP funding to address safety concerns expressed by both the FAA and CALTRANS.

Reid Hillview Airport Serves a Critical Role

The FAA strongly opposes the closure of RHV. The FAA would like for the Board to revisit RHV’s functional importance and consider alternatives that would enhance airport safety and its contribution to the surrounding community.

RHV serves a critical need for the greater San Jose area as well as the National Airspace System (NAS). In particular:

- RHV is an important asset in the National Plan of Integrated Airports System (NPIAS). The FAA has designated RHV as a reliever airport to both San Jose International Airport (SJC) and San Francisco International Airport (SFO). As a designated reliever airport, RHV has aviation facilities that support usage by a large number of smaller, slower, aircraft that may otherwise operate out large airports like SJC that serve the region’s air carrier and corporate demand.

- Based on public comments received at your December 2018 meeting as well as the County’s Airports Business Plan, RHV has nine Fixed Based Operators and complements the general aviation activities of the Palo Alto, San Martin and San Carlos airports.
• RHV serves users that are training to fly under Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) conditions that need to operate at an airport with an Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). If RHV were to close, these aviation users would need to relocate to an airport with an ATCT.

• RHV is currently utilized by San Jose State University to conduct classes offered by the Department of Aviation and Technology. If RHV becomes unavailable, the program would need to relocate to another airport, most likely in relatively close proximity to the main university.

We understand that some on the Board may believe that upon closure of RHV the County’s other airport, San Martin (E16), will accommodate traffic currently at RHV. This expectation is unrealistic given the limited facilities currently at E16. The Board will need to make substantial improvements at E16, prior to the closure of RHV, if it intends for that airport to serve the same role as RHV. Some of the improvements may not be eligible for AIP funding and would therefore need to be funded by the County. Simply put, if RHV were to close, the Board would need to ensure that E16 had the following facilities in place if E16 were to accommodate users currently at RHV:

• RHV has an ATCT whereas E16 has no ATCT. An ATCT would be needed at E16 to support the IFR flight training currently offered at RHV.

• RHV has two parallel runways that are about 3100’ long x 75’ wide whereas E16 has one runway that is about 3100’ long and 75’ wide. E16 will need two runways to support users and traffic currently at RHV.

• RHV has 4 box Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) whereas E16 has a 2 box PAPI. E16 would require a 4 box PAPI to provide the same level of safety currently at RHV.

• RHV has Non-Precision Runway Markings whereas E16 has basic runway markings. E16 would require upgraded runway markings to provide the same level of safety currently at RHV.

• RHV has Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL) whereas E16 has no REIL. E16 would require REILs to provide the same level of safety currently at RHV.

• The Board will need to invest in additional hangers and/or tie down areas at E16 to accommodate aircraft currently at RHV.

We appreciate the County’s interest in finding adequate locations to build low income housing, however, we ask the Board to also consider the adverse impacts of closing RHV. RHV is part of a system of airports that support the economic viability of the County. Closing RHV will force aviation users accounting for about 165,000 annual operations to relocate to other airports in the area. Please understand that many of the public use airports in the Bay Area are physically constrained and may find it difficult to absorb the air traffic activity currently served by RHV.
Federal Obligations For Maintaining A Safe and Efficient Airfield At County Airports

The top priority for the FAA is maintaining safety in the NAS. One important component of our ongoing efforts to manage surface safety within the NAS, is to ensure airport infrastructure is properly maintained at airports such as RHV. When the County accepted AIP funds (most recently in 2011), it agreed to certain obligations (or assurances). A list of these Federal Grant Assurances is attached. These assurances obligate the County to maintain and operate their airport facilities safely and efficiently, and in accordance with specified safety standards, including, but not limited to Assurance 11, Pavement Preventive Maintenance; and Assurance 19, Operation and Maintenance. The County’s obligations related to Assurance 19 at RHV are of great concern to the FAA. We point out that regardless of the Board’s desire to close RHV in 2031, the County’s investment in RHV must commence immediately to ensure the airport’s facilities are maintained and operated safely and efficiently, and in compliance with Federal Grant Assurances.

On December 4, 2018, airport management made a presentation to the Board where they outlined about $10 million that would be required over the next 10 years to maintain RHV’s infrastructure in a safe manner and in compliance with both State and Federal requirements. While the Board may choose to use other sources, such as loans or General Funds, to maintain RHV please note that AIP grant funding would cover about 90% of the County’s cost for addressing existing AIP airfield discrepancies at RHV.

Regardless of the funding source chosen to address airfield concerns at RHV, it is the FAA’s expectation that the Board will make the appropriate investment to ensure a safe operating environment for aircraft and tenants currently operating out of the airport.

Airfield Conditions at Reid-Hillview Airport

The FAA’s Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) recommended changes to markings and signage at RHV in fiscal year 2009. The FAA San Francisco Airports District (ADO) and Regional Office of Airports, along with the California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics have identified safety concerns based on their airport inspections and site visits over the past 10 years. On June 4, 2019, an RHV user notified the FAA that RHV still had several uncorrected discrepancies related to Airport signage and markings. The FAA personnel conducted a site visit on August 16, 2019, confirming that RHV had uncorrected discrepancies. Those items include but are not limited to the items listed below.

**Item 1**

1. Runway 13L - 31R (at the southeast end of the runway): The Runway Exit Sign (sign with the arrow) is non-standard and in a non-standard location. Signs for runway exits are located prior to the runway/taxiway intersection on the side and in the direction to which the aircraft is expected to exit. This Runway Exit Sign must include the single-letter designation of the applicable taxiway being used to exit the runway, along with one arrow, and be repositioned to a location prior to the exit taxiway.

**Item 2**

2. Taxiway Z Direction Sign(s) are incorrectly located on the west side of Taxiway Z. The sign(s) should be relocated to the other side of Z, for use by aircraft entering from ramps/taxilanes. The sign(s) should consist of the letter Z, with an arrow on each side of the
character, and should be of a standard size, as indicated in Advisory Circular 150/5340-18G, Standards for Airport Sign Systems.

Item 3  3. Install Holding Position Signs for Runway 13L on Taxiway E. As indicated by Advisory Circular 150/5340-18G, Runway Holding Position Signs are always placed on the left side of the taxiway as seen by the pilot of an aircraft approaching the runway from the taxiway. Install this sign to the left of the taxiway, in a standard location. Delineate the new boundary of the run-up area with a taxiway edge marking.

Item 4  4. Remove the Runway 31-13 destination sign, located at the right side the runway holding position marking, at Taxiway D. The RSAT recommendation is that the sign is not in a good location because it could distract an aircraft operator or possibly contribute to a runway incursion.

Item 5  5. Remove Taxilane G & F signs located just west of Taxiway Z. The signs are non-standard in appearance and placed in a non-standard location. In addition, these signs are obscuring the view of what appears to be a Taxiway direction sign for Taxiway G.

On March 21, 2019, California Department of Transportation conducted a compliance inspection and noted discrepancies including, but not limited to, the items listed below.

Item 6  1. Three helicopter pads located near the self-service fuel pumps, marked on the airport as established heliports, do not meet the minimum FAA and State design standards for a designated heliport and must be removed or remarked.

Item 7  2. The Runway Safety Area prior to the approach ends of Runways 31R and 31L do not meet the minimum design standards described in Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, Airport Design. The RSA for Runway 31R is currently cleared out to 147 feet and 161 feet for Runway 31L.

Item 8  3. Visual Approach Slope Indicators (VASIs) for 31R are inoperative and were replaced with Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs). Because the VASIs are no longer functional they should be removed as soon as possible.

Item 9  4. The segmented circle visual indicator system is missing traffic pattern indicators for Runway 31L/13R.

Call To Action to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors

The FAA raises these specific, previously noted safety discrepancies to the Board to ensure that the County, as the owner and operator of RHV, immediately addresses the aforementioned airfield signage and markings issues. The presence of non-standard signage, and the poor condition of the airfield signage and markings at RHV increases the risk of the loss of situational awareness for pilots and vehicle drivers. The loss of situational awareness has contributed to an increase of Runway Incursions (RI) at RHV, particularly in the form of Vehicle/Pedestrian Deviations (V/PD) and Pilot Deviations (PD). Combined V/PDs and PDs increased three hundred fifty (350) percent from Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 (two occurrences) to FY 2019 (seven occurrences). V/PDs at RHV increased from two (2) occurrences in FY 2018 to three (3) occurrences in FY 2019. PDs increased from no occurrences in FY 2018 to four (4) occurrences in FY 2019. The County has been unresponsive to
FAA’s adjudication requests regarding the latest V/PDs that occurred on March 11, 2019, and July 10, 2019. Recent inspection and site visits suggest the County should develop financial strategies and identify resources to address operational and maintenance issues to reduce impacts to airport safety.

This letter serves as a Call to Action from the FAA for the Board to address the conditions outlined in this letter immediately. The trends pertaining to increased RIs at RHV combined with the poor airfield condition concerns the FAA and should also concern the Board. Failure of the Board to address these conditions not only ignores liability but also supports an environment that has risk factors that could result in a potentially catastrophic incident at RHV. The FAA would like to assist the Board but as owner and operator of RHV, the County needs to take the lead on addressing safety improvements at RHV. The FAA requests that the County submit an action plan to address critical airfield concerns at RHV within 10 days of receipt of this letter. Please include in your action plan whether the Board plans to fund the improvements with AIP or from other sources. Please submit the action plan to Laurie Suttmeier, Manager, FAA San Francisco Airports District Office.

In closing, the FAA desires to work with, and to have further dialogue with Board in the future to assist with correcting airfield discrepancies, and ensuring RHV continues to play a critical role for the region. FAA would willingly provide federal assistance to the Board to cover about 90% of the costs associated with the AIP eligible airfield improvements at RHV that are identified in this letter. We would appreciate a timely written response from the Board on this matter (i.e., within 30 days).

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact either Brian Armstrong, FAA Manager, Safety and Standards Branch, at 424-405-7303 or Laurie Suttmeier, Manager, FAA San Francisco Airports District Office, at (650) 827-7600

Sincerely,

Mark A. McClardy
Director, Office of Airports
Western-Pacific Region

Enclosures:

Cc: Mike Wasserman, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 1
Cindy Chavez, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 2
Dave Cortese, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 3
Susan Ellenberg, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 4
Harry Freitas, Director, County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department
John Carr, County of Santa Clara, Airports Commission
John Aitken, Director, Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport
Raquel Girvin, FAA Regional Administrator
Tony DiBernardo, FAA, Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Joe Santoro, Runway Safety Program Manager, FAA-Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
Laurie Suttmeier, Manager, San Francisco ADO, FAA-Office of Airports
Amy Choi, Division Chief, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics
November 8, 2019

Mark A. McClardy
Federal Aviation Administration
777 S. Aviation Blvd. Suite 150
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mr. McClardy:

Thank you for your letter of October 18, 2019 to County of Santa Clara Board of Supervisors President Simitian regarding Reid-Hillview Airport (RHV) and related issues. This letter provides the County’s initial response to the issues raised in your correspondence.

In order to ensure that the FAA has a clear understanding of the County’s recent actions regarding Reid-Hillview Airport, the County believes it is important to understand what the Board of Supervisors did and did *not* decide last December. On December 4, 2018 the Board of Supervisors considered recommendations from the administration regarding an update to the Business Plans for the County Airports which include RHV and San Martin airports. The manager and assistant manager of the FAA’s San Francisco Airport District Office were in attendance and provided testimony during the public comment portion of the hearing. At the conclusion of the hearing the Board of Supervisors approved a motion to direct the administration to perform eleven distinct items of work. Attached are official minutes from the meeting as well as a summary of the eleven items in the motion.

As indicated, the motion did not contain any direction to close RHV and replace it with affordable housing. Instead the Board directed the administration to evaluate key issues to better inform the Board and the community about the impact of the existing airport on its neighbors, the possible uses of the land if the airport were to close, implications for San Martin Airport, and direction to pursue property releases for airport parcels not needed for aviation purposes. The Board specifically adopted a policy statement that the County would not apply for Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants for RHV and directed the administration to apply for AIP grants at San Martin. As you can see, there is a great deal of study and public discourse that will have to occur before any decision is made regarding the future of RHV.

Your letter also references improvements that the FAA believes would be necessary at San Martin Airport should RHV close. The County is aware of the capacity and constraints at San
Martin and believes that a discussion on the impacts to San Martin should RHV close are premature at this time. Significant study of the surrounding airports’ aviation capacity would be necessary for the BOS to consider alternative uses at RHV.

Your letter goes on to describes the airfield conditions at RHV and asserts some perceived discrepancies with FAA and Caltrans standards. At the outset, the FAA should be aware that the County is cognizant of the signage issues identified in your letter. It is important to understand, however that when RHV was constructed, the design standards were considerably different than they are today. As a result, at RHV, the distances between runways and taxiways and the size of the Runway Safety Area (RSA) do not meet current FAA standards and are unlikely to change. This results in many challenges when attempting to apply current signage standards to a non-standard airport. Older airports often do not meet current design standards in a number of respects and yet are considered safe.

Further, the County does not agree with the FAA’s characterization of the RHV runway condition as poor. In fact the County has invested significant capital in the airfield surfaces recently though a repaving and marking project that was completed in early 2019. The citation of runway incursion increases in your letter does not indicate a correlation to signage and marking issues raised in your letter. The County would welcome an open exchange of information so that we can better understand your concerns.

As detailed below, the County has acted over the years to address signage issues to assure that pilots can navigate across the airfield considering the limitations imposed by the physical layout and geometry of the airfield and the actual sightlines pilots experience.

Most of the signage at RHV was previously approved by the FAA and included in federally funded Airport Capital Improvement Program (ACIP) grants.

The County is very mindful of the desire of the FAA to standardize the pilot’s experience at airports nationwide and believes that is a worthwhile endeavor, however given the multitude of different airport sizes and configurations across the country a one size fits all approach is not feasible. With that said, the County will continue to work on these concerns as resources allow.

With those general comments, below are responses to the specific signage issues raised in your letter.

Comments from FAA site visit of August 16, 2019
1. *Non-standard exit signs at the southeast end of Runway 13L-31R* - These signs were installed as part of an FAA approved Airport Capital Improvement Program (ACIP) 3-06-0225-10 and partially paid for and approved by the FAA. At the time of installation, the sign was approved by the FAA.
2. *Taxiway Z directional signage* – The geometry of Taxiway Z is such that it is not possible to install upright signs in their “standard” location and have them visible to pilots that have just exited the runway. As part of the paving project completed in
2018 surface painted signage was added to the airport and the upright signs were removed.

3. **Holding positioning signs for Runway 13L on Taxiway E** - There is a holding position sign installed on the right side of the taxiway. This sign location was approved by the FAA and included in ACIP 3-06-0225-10. At that time an evaluation was made based on the current configuration of the airport and it was determined that placing the sign in the “standard” (pilots side) location would move the sign so far left of the taxiway centerline that its placement would cause potential runway incursions. New markings of the boundary of the runup area were installed in 2018.

4. **Runway 31-13 destination sign on the right side of Taxiway D** – The sign placement was included in ACIP 3-06-0225-10, which was approved and funded by the FAA. The RSAT team suggested removing the sign. Airport administration did not agree with that suggestion because there was no data to suggest that the sign was a contributing factor to any V/PD or PD.

5. **Taxilane G & F signage located just west of Taxiway Z** - The sign placement was included in ACIP 3-06-0225-10, which was approved and funded by the FAA. Those are the only situational signs for Taxilane F and G and removal of the signs may confuse pilots and lead to potential V/PD. At this time there is no plan to remove these signs. The additional sign referenced in this item was a Taxiway Z sign that was removed as part of the 2018 paving project (item 2 above).

Comments from the Caltrans compliance inspection of March 21, 2019

1. **Helicopter pads** - These pads are on County property leased to a private entity and were installed and marked by the leaseholder. Airport administration has reviewed the findings of the inspection with the leaseholder who has since remarked the helicopter pads.

2. **Runway Safety Area for 31R and 31L** - The FAA approved Airport Layout Plan for RHV shows a shift of the runways to the north to accommodate the newly mandated RSA area. This project will be implemented by the County when funds become available.

3. **Abandoned Visual Approach Slope Indicator** - That abandoned equipment belongs to the FAA and was recently replaced with Precision Approach Path Indicators. A request has been placed with the FAA to have the equipment removed. Your assistance encouraging the FAA to remove your abandoned equipment would be greatly appreciated.

4. **Segmented circle issue** - The existing configuration of the segmented circle was approved by the FAA and installed as part of ACIP 3-06-0225-08. This is a new finding by the inspector and may be addressed when the County completes a lighting and signage project.

We appreciate the opportunity to continue to work with the FAA on issues regarding the County’s airports. Should you have any questions, please call me at 408-573-2438.
We appreciate the opportunity to continue to work with the FAA on issues regarding the County’s airports. Should you have any questions, please call me at 408-573-2438.

Sincerely,

Harry Freitas
Director, County of Santa Clara Roads & Airports Department

Enclosures:
1. Meeting Minutes;
2. Summary of Actions at December 2018 BOS Meeting

Cc: Supervisor Mike Wasserman, District 1, County of Santa Clara
    Supervisor Cindy Chavez, District 2, County of Santa Clara
    Supervisor Dave Cortese, District 3, County of Santa Clara
    Supervisor Susan Ellenberg, District 4, County of Santa Clara
    Supervisor S. Joseph Simitian, District 5, County of Santa Clara
    John Carr, Airports Commission, County of Santa Clara
    John Aitken, Director, Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport
    Raquel Girvin, FAA Regional Administrator
    Tony DiBernardo, FAA Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
    Joe Santoro, Runway Safety Program Manager, FAA Air Traffic Organization (ATO)
    Laurie Suttmeier, Manager, San Francisco ADO, FAA Office of Airports
    Amy Choi, Division Chief, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics
17 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Vice President
SECONDER: Dave Cortese, Supervisor
AYES: Wasserman, Chavez, Cortese, Yeager, Simitian

18. Held from November 20, 2018 (Item No. 23): Consider recommendations relating to bids for Capital Project 263-CP19003 "Relocate 2nd Floor Dental Suite at Main Jail North." (Facilities and Fleet Department) (ID# 93983)

Possible action:

a. Award contract to Agbayani Construction Corporation in the amount of $709,000 with a construction time of 160 working days.

b. Approve encumbrance of additional $100,000 as Supplemental Work Allowance for a total encumbered amount of $809,000.

c. Authorize County Executive, or designee, to issue Change Orders, as necessary, against the allowance for Supplemental Work and to approve modifications to the construction time consistent with Public Contract Code Section 20142.

d. Ratify Addendum to Bid Documents Nos. 1 through 3 which modified or clarified the Bid Documents in response to contractor questions.

Added to the Consent Calendar at the request of Supervisor Wasserman.

18 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Vice President
SECONDER: Dave Cortese, Supervisor
AYES: Wasserman, Chavez, Cortese, Yeager, Simitian

19. Under advisement from the December 12, 2017 Board meeting (Item No.21):
Receive report from the Roads and Airports Department relating to the Airports Business Plan Update. (ID# 93897)

Taken out of order after Item No. 22.

Seventy-two individuals addressed the Board.

On motion of Vice President Chavez, seconded by Supervisor Cortese, the Board approved a policy statement that the County will not apply for Airport Improvement Program grants for Reid-Hillview Airport and will make General Fund-funded improvements necessary to safely operate Reid-Hillview; and, directed Administration or its designee to accept $1 million in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) entitlement funding related to the airfield repaving project at the San Martin Airport to help pay down the outstanding General Fund loan, to apply for property releases at Reid-Hillview Airport from the FAA consistent with the Business Plan Update, to invite
the City of San Jose to engage in a joint planning process within the next two years relating to use of the Reid-Hillview and Eastridge areas, including possible alternative uses after 2031, to develop a plan, including a transparent community engagement process that includes, but is not limited to, engaging the City of San Jose, to consolidate the County's aviation uses at San Martin Airport based on the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee's Option 3 identified in staff's presentation, to develop a plan to implement improvements necessary to ensure adequate traffic flow and safety on East San Martin Avenue, Highway 101, and adjacent roadways, to establish a Capital Plan to implement improvements at the San Martin Airport, including both General Fund-funded and FAA-funded improvements, to report to the Board with a recommended plan to analyze and address any concerns regarding airborne lead and associated concerns, to engage San Jose State University relating to negotiations for possible accommodation at the San Martin Airport, to engage Office of Emergency Services partners relating to consideration of capacity for emergency and disaster response should a change of use occur at Reid-Hillview Airport, and to engage the aviation community in determining the feasibility of allowing only non-lead aviation fuel at the Reid-Hillview and San Martin Airports.

19 RESULT: APPROVED AS AMENDED [3 TO 2]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Vice President
SECONDER: Dave Cortese, Supervisor
AYES: Chavez, Cortese, Yeager
NAYS: Wasserman, Simitian

Board Referrals

20. Approve referral to Santa Clara County Fire District and Administration to report to the Board of Supervisors no later than February 2019 relating to preparedness planning and County Fire needs given the ever-increasing threats of large-scale fire incidents in the County and throughout California. (Chavez) (ID# 94470)

Taken out of order after Item No. 9.

Approved as amended to direct Administration and the Administration of the Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District to report to the Board in March or April 2019, at the request of Tony Bowden, Chief, Santa Clara County Fire Department, to ensure sufficient time to coordinate with the South Santa Clara County Fire District and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

At the request of Supervisor Wasserman, the Board further directed Administration to involve the Roads and Airports Department in the assessment of resources.

20 RESULT: APPROVED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Cindy Chavez, Vice President
SECONDER: Ken Yeager, Supervisor
AYES: Wasserman, Chavez, Cortese, Yeager, Simitian
SCC Airports Business Plan Referral

At the request of Vice President Chavez, the Board approved:

1. A policy statement that the County will not apply for Airport Improvement Program grants for Reid-Hillview Airport and will make General Fund-funded improvements necessary to safely operate Reid-Hillview,

2. Directed Administration or its designee to accept $1 million in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) entitlement funding related to the airfield repaving project at the San Martin Airport to help pay down the outstanding General Fund loan

3. To apply for property releases at Reid-Hillview Airport from the FAA consistent with the Business Plan Update

4. To invite the City of San Jose to engage in a joint planning process within the next two years relating to use of the Reid-Hillview and Eastridge areas, including possible alternative uses after 2031

5. To develop a plan, including a transparent community engagement process that includes, but is not limit to, engaging the City of San Jose, to consolidate the County's aviation uses at San Martin Airport based on the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee's Option 3 identified in staff's presentation

6. To develop a plan to implement improvements necessary to ensure adequate traffic flow and safety on East San Martin Avenue, Highway 101, and adjacent roadways

7. To establish a Capital Plan to implement improvements at the San Martin Airport, including both General Fund-funded and FAA-funded improvements

8. To report to the Board with a recommended plan to analyze and address any concerns regarding airborne lead and associated concerns
9. To engage San Jose State University relating to negotiations for possible accommodation at the San Martin Airport

10. To engage Office of Emergency Services partners relating to consideration of capacity for emergency and disaster response should a change of use occur at Reid-Hillview Airport

11. And to engage the aviation community in determining the feasibility of allowing only non-lead aviation fuel at the Reid-Hillview and San Martin Airports.
DATE: December 19, 2019  
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)  
FROM: Megan Doyle, Clerk of the Board  
SUBJECT: Correspondence from Airports Commission

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report relating to recommendations from the Airports Commission regarding Reid-Hillview Airport and forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no fiscal impact as a result of receiving this correspondence.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
The Airports Commission acknowledged concerns identified by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) relating to operational safety and maintenance requirements at Reid-Hillview Airport, and forwarded the attached correspondence from the Commission to the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
At the December 3, 2019 Airports Commission meeting, the Commission discussed correspondence from the Federal Aviation Administration relating to County Airports. The Roads and Airports Department provided a written response to the FAA advising of inaccuracies in the content provided by the FAA letter dated October 18, 2019.

The Commission unanimously approved forwarding the attached recommendation from Chairperson Carr to the Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee.
The Commission also requested that the Board of Supervisors consider the implementation of an outlined timeline and action plan to address the concerns raised by the FAA.

The Clerk of the Board serves as the ex-officio secretary of the Airports Commission, and this report is forwarded on the Commission’s behalf.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The correspondence will not be received.

**STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL**

The Clerk of the Board will notify the Airports Commission of any action taken by the Committee.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Letter from Chairperson Carr (Reid-Hillview Airport Funding) (DOCX)
- FAA Letter relating to RHV Airport (PDF)
- Roads and Airports Department Response to correspondence from FAA (PDF)
Dear Supervisor Simitian;

This Commission fully endorses the letter from the FAA to the Board of Supervisors dated October 18, 2019.

Also, this Commission strongly advises the Board of Supervisors to authorize an immediate funding release to address the issues raised by the FAA in order to ensure that Reid-Hillview Airport is brought up to full National Safety Standards.

Furthermore, an action plan as requested by the FAA, outlining the timeline for implementing these actions must be submitted to the FAA.

For the Commission,

John Carr
Chair
Santa Clara County Airports Commission

Cc:

Mike Wasserman, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 1
Cindy Chavez, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 2
Dave Cortese, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 3
Susan Ellenberg, County of Santa Clara, Supervisor, District 4
Harry Freitas, Director, County of Santa Clara Roads and Airports Department
DATE: January 16, 2020
TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)
FROM: Jo Zientek, Director, Consumer/Environmental Protection Agency
SUBJECT: Report relating to New Animal Services Center Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the construction and funding of a new County Animal Services Center.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There is no fiscal impact as a result of receiving this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At the March 16, 2017, meeting, the Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee (HLUET) asked that Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA) provide a bi-monthly update on the development of the County’s new Animal Services Center.

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.

SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
The project remains on schedule with the following updates:

- Roof pan decking and concrete slabs for the building have been completed. Interior rough-in, including fire sprinkler system, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical has begun. Interior/exterior wall framing, and roofing have been started.
• Staff from FAF, XL Construction, Dreyfuss + Blackford Architecture, and CEPA continue to meet weekly to ensure the project remains on schedule and budget, and to identify and resolve potential issues.

• CEPA initiated donor outreach efforts to address any needs for the new Center and to strategize on the cultivation of donor relationships to support future programming.

• CEPA utilized social media to promote end-of-year giving to the Animal Services Center.

• The Animal Services winter newsletter was published and distributed to customers and supporters. This e-newsletter promoted tribute donations and targeted initiatives including Home for the Holidays adoptions and Holiday Sleepover fostering.

• Staff will work with San Jose State University’s upper-division advertising class on incorporating student projects completed December 2019 into the fundraising campaign.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION**

The Committee will not receive the report.
DATE: January 16, 2020

TO: Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET)

FROM: Ky Le, Director, Office of Supportive Housing

SUBJECT: Supportive Housing Reports

RECOMMENDED ACTION
Consider recommendations relating to Supportive Housing System of Care reports. (Office of Supportive Housing)

Possible action:

a. Receive monthly report relating to Supportive Housing System Dashboard.

b. Receive semi-annual report relating to Homelessness Prevention programs.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no fiscal implications associated with this informational report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION
At its meeting on January 12, 2016 (Item No. 11), the Board of Supervisors directed the Administration to provide the Board with recurring reports or dashboards about the capacity and effectiveness of the supportive housing system for homeless individuals and families. The purpose of the reports is to communicate the impact of the County and community investments in solutions to prevent and end homelessness. On October 19, 2017 (Item No. 13), the Housing, Land Use, Environment, and Transportation Committee (HLUET) approved a monthly reporting schedule that includes a Supportive Housing System Dashboard and a semi-annual program type or subpopulation report or annual system report.

Attached is the Supportive Housing System Dashboard Report and the semi-annual report on Homelessness Prevention Programs (Attachment A).

CHILD IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on children and youth.
SENIOR IMPACT
The recommended action will have no/neutral impact on seniors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS
The recommended action will have no/neutral sustainability implications.

BACKGROUND
The supportive housing system includes Permanent Supportive Housing programs (PSH), Rapid Rehousing programs (RRH), Homelessness Prevention programs (HP) and a Crisis Response system of outreach services, emergency shelter and transitional housing. The backbone to the system of care is a coordinated entry system with a robust Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and dedicated staff to support performance management, compliance with federal grants and system planning.

This report describes the type, content of and frequency of reports that the Office of Supportive Housing (OSH) would provide to the Board.

Types of Reports

- Supportive Housing System Report – This report describes the overall supportive housing system of care. The report’s primary function is to communicate whether different program types are contributing to an overall reduction in homelessness. For example, the report describes housing placement rates across all programs.

- System Component Reports – OSH provides four reports, one each for PSH, RRH, HP and Temporary Housing strategies. The primary purpose of these reports is to summarize the effectiveness of all programs under each strategy.

- Sub-Population Reports – OSH provides reports for certain sub-populations. Currently, the only sub-population scheduled for ongoing reporting is homeless veterans. This report provides the Board with a summary of the community’s progress toward ending veteran homelessness. Unlike the System Component Reports, this report summarizes the effectiveness of the entire supportive housing system as it relates to homeless veterans, who can and are served by the full range of supportive housing programs.

Report Content

- Programmatic Capacity – Each report describes the total resources that were available to serve homeless individuals and families. Depending on the program type, the resources are categorized in different ways. For example, emergency shelter capacity is reported as the number of shelter beds or units, whereas Homelessness Prevention capacity is reported as the number of households the system is expects to serve annually.
Utilization – Each report provides the utilization rates of applicable programs. As with program capacity, utilization is described differently for different programs. For example, emergency shelter utilization is typically limited to how often shelter beds are occupied. However, for PSH programs, utilization reports consider both enrollment in services and the number of enrolled clients who are housed.

Performance Measures – As a requirement of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009, OSH and local stakeholders established performance measures by program type and for the supportive housing system. Each report includes the relevant programs’ progress toward community-approved performance measures. For example, housing retention after 12 months is a key performance measure for PSH programs.

Demographic Information – Each report describes program participants basic characteristics including race, ethnicity, gender, and age.

Other – Each report may include additional information such as expansion opportunities (e.g., new grant opportunities) and development activities (e.g., new permanent supportive housing projects).

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

The HLUET committee would not receive the requested reports. OSH would continue providing the current reports on a monthly basis for system reporting and management purposes.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A - Supportive Housing System and Homelessness Prevention Report (PDF)
January 6, 2020

TO: Board of Supervisors
   Housing, Land Use, Environment and Transportation Committee (HLUET) Committee

FROM: Ky Le, Office of Supportive Housing (OSH)

SUBJECT: Supportive Housing System in Santa Clara County and Homelessness Prevention Report

The attached report highlights trends, successes, and challenges of the supportive housing system in Santa Clara County between December 2018 and November 2019. The report's primary function is to communicate whether different programs are contributing to an overall reduction in homelessness. The supportive housing system includes housing programs that fall into four main categories: Emergency Shelter (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Additionally, this report provides supplementary data focusing on the County's homelessness prevention efforts.

Supportive Housing System Trends and Highlights

As demonstrated in Appendix B, the capacity of housing and homeless programs continues to grow, with the largest increase over the past year in Homelessness Prevention (HP) programs, which increased from 919 households served to 1,540 households served. Program utilization remained high across the housing system, with the highest utilization rates in RRH and HP programs.

Appendix C includes key system performance measures, benchmarks for which are determined in coordination with community partners on an annual basis. Notable trends and highlights from the reporting period include the following:

Board of Supervisors: Mike Wasserman, Cindy Chavez, Dave Cortese, Susan Ellenberg, S. Joseph Simitian
County Executive: Jeffrey V. Smith
• As shown in chart 1, the number of people served in ES, TH, RRH and PSH programs has increased by 5% from two years ago. The number of people served in the system is limited by the capacity of programs, so as program capacity has increased, the number of households served has increased.

• Chart 2 shows that exits from housing programs to permanent housing destinations increased systemwide from 30% to 32% over the past year. Exits from RRH programs showed the largest increase year over year, from 69% to 74%.

• Chart 3 illustrates that permanent supportive housing retention remains high, exceeding the system-wide 95% benchmark over the past year and reaching the highest rate over the three-year period reported.

The upper chart in Appendix D shows the number of households moving from homelessness to permanent housing, and the type of project from which they were receiving assistance. The lower chart indicates the number of households that moved to permanent housing for the period, compared to the number of households assessed for the first time (new entries to the homeless system). Households entering the homeless system for the first time continue to outpace the rate at which households are moving into permanent housing. Notably, the number of households entering the system for the first time in October and November 2019 was higher than the monthly average over the past 12 months and the OSH will continue to monitor the inflow to determine whether this represents a trend or a one-time occurrence. The number of housing placements remains high and is expected to increase slightly in December and January with households moving into Villas on the Park and Renascent Place, two new PSH developments.

Appendix E displays data on returns to homelessness for households that were permanently housed through the supportive housing system. While only 5% of households served in permanent supportive housing programs returned to homelessness within two years, households that exited to permanent housing from other types of programs returned to homelessness at a higher rate. Fifteen percent of households exiting RRH programs, for example, return to the housing system within two years. While this outcome suggests that most individuals and families remain stably housed, some households enrolled in RRH may need additional assistance to achieve housing stability after exiting the program.

**Homelessness Prevention Programs**

Appendices F through I highlight outcomes and trends within the HP programs and include data from the Homelessness Prevention System (HPS) and the Emergency Assistance Network Homelessness Prevention programs (EAN HP). While both the HPS and EAN HP programs are operated by the same network of service providers, the HPS system is coordinated through a central organization and intended to provide more flexible
assistance, including providing funding for transportation, temporary motel stays, and more. All HP programs provide rental assistance, security deposit, and utility assistance.

Highlights from the HP programs include:

- Appendix F demonstrates the growth of HP programs, with 1,446 served in the past year, an increase of 15% from the total in FY2019. With increased funding for HPS and a high need for prevention services, the OSH expects the utilization of HP programs to continue to increase.

- Appendix G shows that the most common reason households request assistance through HPS or EAN HP programs is a loss of income.

- Appendix H includes charts displaying the type of assistance provided, as well as the average amount of assistance per household. Predictably, rental assistance is the most common type of assistance provided and averages $3,647 per household for HPS and $1,592 per household for the EAN HP programs. The larger amount for the HPS program reflects the additional flexibility in the program design, as some individuals and families are assisted for more than one month.

- Appendix I shows demographic information for HP programs. When compared to individuals and families being served across the housing system, a higher percentage of households accessing HP programs are female. This is likely due to the higher number of families with children accessing HP programs, of which the majority have a female head of household.
Appendix A: Progress to Community Plan to End Homelessness Goal of 6,000 Housing Opportunities

Jan 2015 Baseline: 2,635 Housing Units/Vouchers
Goal: to add 6,000 Housing Units/Vouchers by 2020

53% to Goal

Goal: 2,809 Units/Vouchers to be Completed by 2020

Office of Supportive Housing
Supportive Housing System Dashboard
December 1, 2018 – November 30, 2019

Goal: 2,809 Units/Vouchers to be Completed by 2020

6,0000

Jan 2015 Baseline: 2,635 Housing Units/Vouchers
Goal: to add 6,000 Housing Units/Vouchers by 2020

2,278 Units/Vouchers added since Jan 2015
913 Units in the Pipeline
Goal: 2,809 Units/Vouchers to be Completed by 2020

Appendix B: Capacity and Utilization as of 11/30/2019

Program Capacity (Units or Households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>November 2018</th>
<th>November 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)</td>
<td>3362</td>
<td>3430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Rehousing (RRH)</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing (TH)</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter (ES)</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Weather Shelter (CWS)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclement Weather Shelter (IW)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Parking (SP)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Prevention (HP)</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Utilization, November 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program utilization is based on households who are enrolled in programs that are tracked in HMIS.
- PSH programs that are not tracked in HMIS include HUD VASH (1,222 units) and other programs which comprise 57 units. PSH capacity includes 50 units which are Permanent Housing with services (no disability required).
- For Safe Parking programs, one parking space is the equivalent of one unit of capacity with an estimated 2.5 individuals per vehicle; Shelter capacity is measured using beds.
- Rapid Rehousing and Homelessness Prevention capacity is based on the estimated number of households that agencies are expected to serve in one year.

Attachment: Attachment A - Supportive Housing System and Homelessness Prevention
Appendix C: System Performance Measures

1. Total System Entries and Homelessness for the First Time

- Persons with Entries into ES, SH, TH, or PH
- Inflow: People Experiencing Homelessness for the First Time

*“First Time” per HUD = no entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Entries</th>
<th>Inflow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/16-11/30/17</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>4,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/17-11/30/18</td>
<td>7,897</td>
<td>5,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/18-11/30/19</td>
<td>8,125</td>
<td>5,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations

Of Persons in ES, TH, and RRH who Exited, the Percentage of Successful Exits to Permanent Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>System (40% Benchmark)</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (75% Benchmark)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (75% Benchmark)</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter (30% Benchmark)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/16-11/30/17</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/17-11/30/18</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/18-11/30/19</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Permanent Housing Retention

Percentage of People in Permanent Housing Programs (excluding Rapid Rehousing) Retaining Housing during the Reporting Year (Benchmark = 95%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/16-11/30/17</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/17-11/30/18</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/18-11/30/19</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Housing Placements and System Entries by Month 12/1/2018-11/30/2019

Monthly Housing Placements from Project Types (Head of Household)

Number of Households Placed in Housing and Households Requesting Assistance for the First Time (First VI-SPDAT Assessment)
Appendix E: Returns to Homelessness

Returns to Homelessness (Within 6 Months)
After exiting to Permanent Housing Destinations, the Percentage of People who Return to Homelessness within 6 Months (N = Exits to PH between 12/2016 to 11/2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System (2019 N=2606)</th>
<th>Permanent Housing (N=456)</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (N=814)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (N=539)</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter (N=777)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returns to Homelessness (Within 1 Year)
After exiting to Permanent Housing Destinations, the Percentage of People who Return to Homelessness within 1 Year (N = Exits to PH between 12/2016 to 11/2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System (2019 N=2606)</th>
<th>Permanent Housing (N=456)</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (N=814)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (N=539)</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter (N=777)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returns to Homelessness (Within 2 Years)
After exiting to Permanent Housing Destinations, the Percentage of People who Return to Homelessness within 2 Years (N = Exits to PH between 12/2016 to 11/2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>System (2019 N=2606)</th>
<th>Permanent Housing (N=456)</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (N=814)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (N=539)</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter (N=777)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HP Program Goals and Households Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HP Program</th>
<th>Annual Capacity (Households)</th>
<th>Enrolled Households (Dec 1, 2018 to Nov 30, 2019)</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPS</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAN HP</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HP Program Goals and Households Served

- **Total Goals (Capacity)**
  - HPS: 900
  - EAN HP: 400

- **Total Enrolled Households**
  - Dec 1, 2018 to Nov 30, 2019:
    - HPS: 897
    - EAN HP: 575

- **Utilization Rates**
  - HPS: 100%
  - EAN HP: 144%
Appendix G: Homelessness Prevention Types of Assistance, Dec 2018 to Nov 2019

HPS - Reasons for Assistance (Number of Household Enrollments)

- Income loss (i.e., job loss, benefits ended): 28%, 267
- Change in family composition (i.e., separation, death, etc.): 12%, 115
- Medical emergency (self or family member): 11%, 100
- Must leave current living situation (i.e., overcrowded, asked to leave, argument...): 10%, 96
- Income reduction (i.e., work hours reduction, benefits reduction, etc.): 9%, 89
- Unexpected major expense: 9%, 85
- Other: 6%, 55
- Fleeing domestic/family violence: 6%, 55
- Moving from temporary arrangement to permanent housing: 4%, 40
- Rent increase (incl. moving to new unit): 3%, 28
- Moving from an unsafe or illegal unit: 1%, 11

EAN HP - Reasons for Assistance (Number of Household Enrollments)

- Income loss (i.e., job loss, benefits ended): 23%, 23
- Moving from temporary arrangement to permanent housing: 21%, 1
- Unexpected major expense: 11%, 64
- Income reduction (i.e., work hours reduction, benefits reduction, etc.): 10%, 59
- Medical emergency (self or family member): 9%, 50
- Must leave current living situation (i.e., overcrowded, asked to leave, argument...): 8%, 46
- Rent increase (incl. moving to new unit): 7%, 44
- Change in family composition (i.e., separation, death, etc.): 4%, 26
- Other: 4%, 21
- Moving from an unsafe or illegal unit: 2%, 12
- Fleeing domestic/family violence: 2%, 10
Appendix H: Homelessness Assistance Types and Amounts, Dec 2018 to Nov 2019

HPS: Number of Service Transactions for Each Assistance Type
(1,774 Total Transactions for 764 Households)

- Rental Assistance: 81%, 1,432
- Security Deposit: 9%, 156
- Utilities: 5%, 81
- Transportation: 2%, 35
- Motel: 0%, 2
- Other: 4%, 68

EAN HP: Number of Service Transactions for Each Assistance Type
(601 Total Transactions for 505 Households)

- Rental Assistance: 385
- Security Deposit: 200
- Utilities: 11
- Other: 5

HPS: Average Amount of Assistance
Total Amount of Assistance: $2,912,987

- Rental Assistance: $3,647
- Security Deposit: $2,282
- Utilities: $474
- Transportation: $959
- Motel: $1,262
- Other: $1,362

EAN HP: Average Amount of Assistance
Total Amount of Assistance: $937,934

- Rental Assistance: $1,592.41
- Security Deposit: $1,834.97
- Utilities: $457.41
- Other: $731.17
Appendix I: Homelessness Prevention Demographics of Unduplicated Households, Dec 2018 to Nov 2019

**HP Enrollments by Race**
- **White**: 58% (HPS), 57% (EAN HP)
- **Client doesn’t know**: 16% (HPS), 7% (EAN HP)
- **Black or African American**: 20% (HPS), 11% (EAN HP)
- **Asian**: 5% (HPS), 5% (EAN HP)
- **American Indian or Alaska Native**: 4% (HPS), 3% (EAN HP)
- **Multi-Racial**: 3% (HPS), 4% (EAN HP)
- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**: 3% (HPS), 3% (EAN HP)

**HP Enrollments by Ethnicity**
- **Hispanic/Latino**: 63% (HPS), 50% (EAN HP)
- **Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino**: 35% (HPS), 49% (EAN HP)

**HP Enrollments by Age Tier**
- **18 to 24**: 24% (HPS), 21% (EAN HP)
- **25 to 34**: 33% (HPS), 28% (EAN HP)
- **35 to 44**: 21% (HPS), 22% (EAN HP)
- **45 to 54**: 12% (HPS), 17% (EAN HP)
- **55 to 64**: 6% (HPS), 8% (EAN HP)
- **65 or Above**: 5% (HPS), 5% (EAN HP)

**HP Enrollments by Gender**
- **Female**: 76% (HPS), 73% (EAN HP)
- **Male**: 24% (HPS), 27% (EAN HP)
DATE: December 19, 2019, Regular Meeting
TIME: 10:00 AM
PLACE: Board of Supervisors' Chambers

MINUTES

Opening

1. Call to Order.
Chairperson Wasserman called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. A quorum was present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wasserman</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Joseph Simitian</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Public Comment. (ID# 99794)
Two individuals addressed the Committee.

3. Approve Consent Calendar and changes to the Committee's Agenda.

3 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

Regular Agenda - Items for Discussion

4. Under advisement from the August 27, 2019 meeting of the Board of Supervisors (Item No. 10): Receive report from the Office of Sustainability relating to consideration of options to reduce the effects of climate change, including tree planting. (Office of the County Executive) (ID# 99704)
One individual addressed the Committee.

4 RESULT: RECEIVED

5. Receive report relating to recommendations from the Airports Commission regarding Reid-Hillview Airport and forward to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. (ID# 99686)
One individual addressed the Committee.
Vice Chairperson Simitian requested that Administration report to the Committee in January 2020 relating to consideration of the letter from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regarding airfield conditions at Reid-Hillview Airport, a response letter to the FAA from the County, and correspondence submitted by interested parties, to identify necessary projects to address liability concerns at Reid-Hillview airport, in preparation of the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Budget process to secure funding for the projects.

**5 RESULT:** RECEIVED [UNANIMOUS]
**MOVER:** S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
**SECONDER:** Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
**AYES:** Wasserman, Simitian

6. Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to the status of Lehigh Quarry and Stevens Creek Quarry Reclamation Plan Amendment applications and Notices of Violation. (ID# 99570)

Five individuals addressed the Committee.

Vice Chairperson Simitian requested that County Counsel provide on off-agenda report to the Committee on date uncertain relating to concerns expressed in the letter from the City of Cupertino City Manager, including clarification regarding reclamation plan amendments and illegal segmentation, the extent to which past environmental review can or cannot be used in connection with future applications, and an explanation of legal basis for determining whether a use permit is required either in lieu of, or in addition to, a reclamation plan amendment.

Vice Chairperson Simitian requested that County Counsel provide a public off-agenda report to the Committee on date uncertain relating to whether applicable fines for failing to comply with a Stipulated Order to Comply (SOTC) are sufficient to compel compliance; and, options for remedies that the County can exercise, including other extra contractual options.

Vice Chairperson Simitian stated that he will escalate the matter to the Board of Supervisors in the event that Lehigh Quarry does not respond to the County's revised draft SOTC within 90 days from November 8, 2019.

**6 RESULT:** APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
**MOVER:** S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
**SECONDER:** Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
**AYES:** Wasserman, Simitian

7. Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development, Department of Environmental Health, and Division of Agriculture relating to a proposed agricultural employee housing program. (ID# 99800)

**7 RESULT:** RECEIVED
8. Receive report from the Department of Planning and Development relating to the progress of developing Building Electrification Reach Codes for potential adoption by the Board of Supervisors. (ID# 98888)

Three individuals addressed the Committee.

Vice Chairperson Simitian requested that Administration clarify whether remodels and rebuilds of existing residential structures may be considered as new construction under the amended California Building Standards Code.

The Committee forwarded the report to the Planning Commission, for subsequent forwarding to the Board of Supervisors, with a request for the Commission to consider a full range of options relating to electrification or alternative energy efficiencies for new buildings; and, a request to Administration to report to the Committee on date uncertain with options for consideration relating to incentives that can be offered to developers to encourage electrification of new development projects.

8 RESULT: FORWARDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

Consent Calendar

9. Consider recommendations relating to Supportive Housing System of Care reports. (Office of Supportive Housing) (ID# 99725)

Possible action:

a. Receive monthly report relating to Supportive Housing System Dashboard and semi-annual report relating to Temporary Housing Programs.

b. Receive semi-annual report relating to Permanent Supportive Housing programs.

9 RESULT: RECEIVED

10. Receive report from the Consumer and Environmental Protection Agency relating to the construction and funding of a new County Animal Services Center. (ID# 99721)

10 RESULT: RECEIVED

11. Receive annual drought report from the Office of Sustainability relating to current drought conditions. (Office of the County Executive) (ID# 99224)

11 RESULT: RECEIVED

12. Approve minutes of the November 21, 2019 Regular Meeting.
12 RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: S. Joseph Simitian, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER: Mike Wasserman, Chairperson
AYES: Wasserman, Simitian

Adjourn

13. Adjourn to the next regular meeting on Thursday, January 16, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

Chairperson Wasserman adjourned the meeting 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Soriano
Deputy Clerk