

Montgomery – Gibbs Executive Airport
Airport Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Serra Mesa – Kearny Mesa Library – Community Room
Monday, October 16, 2017, 3 – 5 p.m.

Advisory Committee Members Present

Al Boyce, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant
Chris Sluka, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Flight School
Dave Ryan, Crownair/Airports Advisory Committee
Henry Sickels, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant
Jackie Ander, Serra Mesa Town Council/Airports Advisory Committee
Joel Pointon, Clairemont Town Council
Lisa Lind, City of San Diego, Planning Department
Robyn Badilla, Kearny Mesa Planning Group
Scott Hasson, Tierrasanta Town Council/Airports Advisory Committee
Tom Reid, Plus One Flyers/Airports Advisory Committee
Bob Basso, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant (Absent)
Brenda Perez, Federal Aviation Administration Airports District Office (Absent)
Chuck McGill, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Flight School (Absent)
Dave Gordon, Plus One/Marigold/NAC Tenant (Absent)
Garret Hollarn, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (Absent)
Heather Dagle (Flattop/Marigold (Absent)
Tom Dray, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tower (Absent)

Project Team Members Present

Wayne Reiter, City of San Diego
Michael Hotaling, C&S
Ralph Redman, C&S
James Duke, Atkins
Natalia Hentschel, Katz & Associates
Marissa Twite, Katz & Associates

Welcome and Introduction

Wayne Reiter welcomed the Advisory Committee (Committee) to the third meeting and thanked them for their participation. Natalia Hentschel then introduced her role as facilitator, briefly reviewed the two previous Committee meetings and summarized the meeting's agenda. The Committee members were asked to introduce themselves and the organizations they represent.

Committee members received the meeting agenda, a Facility Requirements frequently asked questions document, an Environmental Overview frequently asked questions document and a copy of the meeting's PowerPoint presentation to place in the binders provided at the first meeting.

To view project and meeting materials, including new binder contents and the presentation, visit the airports master plan website at <http://www.SDAirportPlans.com/documents/>

Public Meeting Overview

N. Hentschel began the meeting by reviewing the first public meeting for the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport (MYF) Master Plan that was held on Aug. 23, 2017. The public meeting was held at the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department's Metropolitan Operations Complex II. Attendees had the opportunity to speak with the project team, learn more about the Master Plan and provide comments and feedback.

Committee members were asked to provide feedback on the public meeting and share any recommendations to improve attendance. The following is feedback and questions regarding the public meeting:

- A. Boyce: There should be at least one-month prior notification for future public meetings.
- S. Hasson: How much advance notice was given for the first public meeting?
 - The public meeting was advertised two to three weeks before.
- J. Pointon: The public meetings could be announced at town council meetings. Many town councils have community newsletters and calendars where public meetings can also be posted. Nextdoor.com is also a good resource to announce meetings, as many communities have their own account. I recommend utilizing those resources to get the word out to surrounding neighborhoods and interested community members.
- T. Reid: Public meetings could be advertised on social media, Facebook for example.
- J. Pointon: Several town councils and community organization also have Facebook accounts, public meetings can be announced through those accounts.
- S. Hasson: There should be increased community representation from the La Jolla and Linda Vista neighborhoods at these Committee meetings. Those representatives can then notify their communities of the public meetings.
- J. Ander: A website that is available to everyone can be set up.
- J. Pointon: Councilmembers Chris Cate and Lori Zapf both distribute notifications of community events. Public meetings should be included in those notifications.
- R. Badilla: I am available to hand deliver fliers of public meetings to my community.
- T. Reid: The first public meeting was held during a good time of day. It accommodated work schedules and allowed for a good turnout.
- S. Hasson: The location of the first public meeting was also excellent. It was central to all the communities adjacent to MYF.
- S. Hasson: Once more information is available there will be a better turnout.
- C. Sluka: I agree. More people will attend the public meetings if they have a personal stake in the airport. Once information of a more general interest, like noise, is available more people will show interest in the public meetings.

Working Paper #3 – Facility Requirements

Before presenting Working Paper #3 – Facility Requirements to the Committee, Michael Hotaling reviewed the results of the Forecast of Aviation Demand, including MYF historical activity, operations peaking and critical aircraft. M. Hotaling informed the Committee that the Forecast was approved by the Federal Aviation Administration on Jun. 30, 2017.

Working Paper #3 – Facility Requirements was defined as the evaluation of improvements or additional airside and landside facilities required to accommodate the forecasted aviation activity. Ralph Redman presented the data sources used to prepare Working Paper #3. The sources used were:

- Working Paper #1 - Inventory
- Working Paper #2 - Forecast of Aviation Demand
- FAA Advisory Circulars
- Airport Cooperative Research Program publications

Facility Requirements – Airside

James Duke presented on the airside facility requirements studied and identified in Working Paper #3, including airfield operating configurations, airfield capacity and airfield capabilities.

N. Hentschel requested that Committee members share recommendations on additional airside facilities that are needed or should be improved. The following are feedback and questions regarding airside facility requirements:

- T. Reid: Is the critical aircraft identified in the MYF Forecast of Aviation Demand the largest aircraft used at the airport?
 - The critical aircraft is the aircraft that has the most demand, it is not necessarily the largest. Critical aircraft is what we expect to see on a frequent basis and is defined by the FAA as having at least 500 annual operations at the airport.
- D. Ryan: What were assumptions used that resulted in an increase in the Aviation Demand Forecast? I am curious if it is based on national or local trends.
 - A variety of factors were considered, like trends in aviation and demographics. These factors were fed into an analysis model and compared to the FAA forecast. Many airports similar to MYF are experiencing flat growth or decline.
- T. Reid: Would increasing the capacity of the runways mean bigger runways or more runways?
 - It would mean increasing both the size and number of runways
- C. Sluka: The capacity of runways should be increased to avoid bottlenecks.
- S. Hasson: Taking into account the need for an instrument approach, what is the capacity of the airfield?
 - Based on approaches the capacity is 55 hourly operations.
- S. Hasson: 55 operations seem like a lot, I do not see that as a realistic number.
- T. Reid: Three minutes between operations is the standard. That does not fit in to the 55 operations per hour number.
 - It is a theoretical calculation of the highest capacity that the airfield can accommodate.
- T. Reid: Do the airfield capabilities include runup areas?
 - Yes, in FAA vernacular holdup areas are known as holding bays.
- J. Ander: Helicopters were not included in any of the facility requirements. They occupy space and use MYF for takeoff and landings.

- J. Pointon: There are noise monitoring systems located off- field. Those noise monitoring systems should be included in the airport facilities inventory and there should be requirements to keep them maintained.
- S. Hasson: Upgrades to noise monitoring systems should be discussed at these Committee meetings.

Facility Requirements – Landside

R. Redman presented the landside facility requirements that were studied and identified. The landside facility requirements included aircraft hangars, apron area, aircraft parking, terminal facilities, support facilities and non-aeronautical development areas.

Committee members were asked to provide feedback or share additional landside facilities that are needed. The following are questions and comments regarding landside facilities:

- T. Reid: What is the typical size for a conventional/box hangar?
 - The typical size is 1,200 – 1,400 square-feet.
- H. Sickles: The dynamics of aircraft are changing, the next generation of airplanes will have a wingspan of 45 feet. The conventional and T- hangars that are in use today will not accommodate these newer airplanes and Port-to-Port hangars are aging out. There is increasing demand for more square hangars. Potential occupants with newer aircrafts will not necessarily be interested in T-hangars. But more people will be attracted to MYF if more conventional hangars are available that could accommodate aircraft with larger wingspans.
- H. Sickles: There needs to be more land set aside for larger, conventional hangars.
- T. Reid: Plus One Flyers Club has about 75 planes that are older and our T-hangars are perfectly adequate. As long as the T-hangars are upgraded and maintained, they could still be used by newer aircrafts. The 25 additional T-hangars are really important to have because we want to attract more pilots and more airplanes to the airport.
- D. Ryan: I receive two to five phone calls per week requesting bigger hangars.
- S. Hasson: Only 25 T-hangars over 20 years seems low, it needs to be significantly increased. We want MYF to be visible to new pilots.
- S. Hasson: Improvements to terminal facilities should be discussed here, as they are in need of drastic improvements. Airports with good terminal facilities are Deer Valley, Mesa Falcon Field, Henderson Executive Airport and Colorado Springs Peterson Field.
- S. Hasson: The terminal should have adequate restroom facilities with showers, a pilot’s lounge with computer terminals where pilots can check the weather and flight information and conference rooms for corporate events. Also, MYF really needs rental car options. These are the types of services pilots want from terminal facilities.
- J. Pointon: I agree, improved facilities can attract more pilots, businesses and planes.
- C. Sluka: Corporate flights do not like MYF because the terminal facilities are lacking and there are no convenient ground transportation options available.
- T. Reid: Terminal improvements do not need to be all provided by the City of San Diego, space can be leased to business who would be responsible for making improvements.
- D. Ryan: Terminal leaseholds can be established for fixed-base operators (FBOs).

Overview of Environmental Baseline Report

J. Duke introduced the Environmental Baseline to the Committee as the evaluation of existing conditions of the MYF property to provide guidance in developing Master Plan alternatives and to minimize environmental impacts of future development and assess the level of review required under the National Environmental Protection Act or NEPA and the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA. J. Duke identified fourteen resource areas that will be evaluated in the environmental analysis and three impact categories: 1) Potentially Significant Impacts, 2) Not Significant Impacts, and 3) No Impact or Resource is Present. J. Duke presented on those resources areas that will be considered under the Potentially Significant Impact category, which include air quality, biological resources, hazardous material, land use and noise. Recommendations for environmental analysis based on the Environmental Baseline were also presented

N. Hentschel requested Committee members provide any comments and ask any questions regarding the Environmental Baseline. The following is feedback provided by the Committee:

- H. Sickles: As jet technology improves, newer airplanes are much quieter. That should be kept in mind when studying noise as potentially significant impact.

Master Plan Process Committee Participation Mid-Point Check-in

To evaluate the members' experience on the advisory committee, N. Hentschel asked Committee members on how they felt about the Advisory Committee process and requested they provide feedback on how the process could be improved. The Committee gave the following comments:

- T. Reid: I think the Master Plan is in good hands. I represent smaller planes and I want to emphasize our need for T-hangars. Also, my interest is to ensure that the City of San Diego understands the needs and importance of smaller stakeholders.
- H. Sickles: I agree that the Master Plan process is in good hands, but there needs to be a balance between future and smaller aircrafts. Also, the City of San Diego needs the foresight to recognize the economic potential of MYF could provide for the San Diego region.
- S. Hasson: I think the outreach for this process is perfect, my community is now better informed. The project team provides really good information and is very professional. The Serra Mesa – Kearny Mesa Library is a much better location than the previous meeting locations.
- Boyce: The Master Plan process so far is a fine. The project team is very professional.
- R. Badilla: The Master Plan process is also working for me. I attend these meetings and make a point to report back to my planning group.
- D. Ryan: The phasing for this process seems to be on track. However, I would recommend adding additional meetings during mid-points of the Master Plan Process, because a lot of information is provided at these meetings and there is not sufficient time for feedback.
- Sluka: I agree with everything that has been said. I am also here to represent smaller stakeholder and to ensure there is a balance between smaller operations, FBOs and corporate operations.

- L. Lind: I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this process. This process is concurrent with the Kearny Mesa Community Plan, so I anticipate future coordination between the two projects.
- J. Ander: I like this venue better than the previous venues, as it has a better environment and is much quieter. I am learning a lot during this process and I am looking forward to future meetings.

General Questions or Comments

In addition to specific feedback requested by the project team, the Committee gave the following comments and questions:

- J. Pointon: It would be helpful to have a bulleted summary of the working papers and other documents. It is the most effective way of relaying information and engaging other people. When I report back to the Clairemont Town Council, there is not enough time to present a narrative, so a bulleted summary would be very helpful.
- J. Pointon: When you make these documents available you should include the definitions of the acronyms. It would make acronyms like VFR and IFR more discernable to the public.

Public Comment

At the meeting's closing, N. Hentschel invited members of the public to provide comment. The following are comments provided by the public:

- Reddit is a good resource to announce public meetings. There is San Diego thread where information about public meetings can be posted, it has a lot of subscribers.
- The Kearny Mesa Planning Group developed a project that proposes shifting the fenced perimeter 30 feet inwards to create a 5.4 mile walking and cycling path around the airport. There is a lot of demand of commuter alternatives and this could provide a benefit. A website has been sent up for the project and the domain name is Airloopark.com.
- I have available an aerial photo of the airport that shows the vernal pools.
- Installing runup enclosures at the end of the runway as part of a noise inhibitor should be considered.

Next Steps

- The project team will incorporate feedback received
- Working Paper #3 and the Environmental Baseline will be finalized
- A second public meeting will be held in November
- The project team will progress to alternatives development