

Brown Field Municipal Airport
Airport Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Quality Inn Suites – Conference Room
Tuesday, October 17, 2017, 3 – 5 p.m.

Advisory Committee Members Present

Clarissa Falcon, Metropolitan Airpark
Gerardo Ramirez, City Council District 8
Larry Rothrock, Brown Field Airport Experiential Aircraft Association
Linda Greenberg, Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce
Lisa Golden, Otay Mesa Planning Group/Airports Advisory Committee
Tom Ricotta, San Diego Jet Center/Airports Advisory Committee
Brenda Perez, Federal Aviation Administration Airports District Office (Absent)
Garret Hollarn, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (Absent)
Mark Demetris, Brown Field Airport Tower (Absent)
Michael Prinz, City of San Diego, Planning Department (Absent)

Project Team Members Present

Wayne Reiter, City of San Diego
Michael Hotaling, C&S
Carly Shannon, 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, an updated Committee member roster 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 Brown Field Municipal Airport (SDM) Master Plan Update that was held on Aug. 24, 2017. The public meeting was held at the Colonel Irving Community Activity Center. Attendees had the opportunity to speak with the project team, learn more about the Master Plan Update 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:

- C. Falcon: Someone had reached out to the South County Economic Development Council about the public meeting, though there was some confusion about the purpose. There could be better clarity on the purpose of the public meetings and increased general project awareness.
- L. Greenberg: Was the first public meeting advertised in the San Diego Union Tribune?
 - It was not advertised in the San Diego Union Tribune, but was advertised in the La Prensa, the Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce newsletter and the Experimental Aircraft Association newsletter.
- L. Greenberg: There are several stakeholders that have business interest in SDM, but who live much further north. Outreach could be extended to those stakeholders.
- G. Ramirez: I provided the information about the public meeting to the Otay Mesa Recreation Council, as well as the community planning groups. We want to make sure the information about Committee meetings and future public meetings reaches those organizations.
- L. Greenberg: My company subscribes to a service called Inside Prospects. Inside Prospects can provide information on every business with five or more people that is within the Otay Mesa zip code. That information could be used to send out a postcard mailer to notify stakeholders of future public meetings.
- G. Ramirez: Montgomery-Waller Recreation Center has a marquee where public meetings fliers can be posted.
- L. Greenberg: Since SDM affects some areas of unincorporated San Diego, there should be representation from Supervisor Cox's office.
- L. Rothrock: The Experimental Aircraft Association was the largest group in attendance at the public meeting. Our members felt disappointed by the meeting. They thought there was going to be a presentation instead of the poster stations and they felt like they gained very little information.

Working Paper #3 – Facility Requirements

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

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

- Inventory Working Paper #1
- The SDM Forecast of Aviation Demand
- FAA Advisory Circulars
- Airport Cooperative Research Program guidance

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 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. Ricotta: 53 operations per hour seems unlikely. My understanding is that there is a standard of three minutes separating each operation.
- T. Ricotta: SDM only has RNAV approaches, we do not have ILS approaches. SDM just has two approaches.
- T. Ricotta: Runway 26L does not have adequate run-up area for corporate jets. That is a significant issue that should be discussed here.
- L. Golden: That is a good point, there is not enough space for pilots.
- T. Ricotta: The run-up area at the south side of Alpha at Charlie needs to be big enough to accommodate multiple aircraft. The City of San Diego should really think ahead and expand that run-up area.
- T. Ricotta: Runway 26L was temporarily extended in the past during a construction project. The Master Plan should consider expanding 26L to 1,500 ft. length. If 26L was expanded, it could be used by larger aircraft when Runway 26R is not available.

Facility Requirements – Landside

C. Shannon presented the landside facility requirements that were studied and identified. The landside facility requirements included aircraft hangars, apron area, aircraft parking, terminal facilities and support facilities.

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

- L. Rothrock: In regards to adding 61 T-hangars over 20 years, the EAA is planning to add 10-15 hangars.
- L. Rothrock: The project team developed a Forecast of Aviation Demand, but the EAA has also developed a Forecast of Aviation Demand and so has San Diego Jet Center. I recommend looking at our information.
- L. Golden: I would also suggest looking at the Metropolitan Airpark's Forecast of Aviation Demand.
- L. Golden: The access roads are inadequate. They are highly impacted by traffic. If there is weather, the roads fill with puddles as the drainage is poor. Also, the width of the access roads is inadequate.
- C. Falcon: Metropolitan Airpark will be doing some of that access road improvement work.
- L. Golden: That is why I think that coordination between this project and Metropolitan Airpark is important.

- L. Rothrock: I agree with L. Golden that the access roads are inadequate. The access roads to the EAA are not paved and often turn to mud when it rains. Since it is not paved, it is hard to tell when the road begins and ends.
- L. Rothrock: Perimeter roads should also be addressed, as they are inadequate.
- L. Greenberg: Is it possible to get the ultimate build-out plans for Metropolitan Airpark so we can see how FAA mandated facilities will interact or layout compared to facilities built by the Metropolitan Airpark project?
- C. Falcon: The Metropolitan Airpark project team works very closely with the City of San Diego, but we can provide information to this Committee. We can also provide a short presentation at a future meeting.
- T. Ricotta: The U.S. Customs was going to build a temporary structure for their operations, but a permanent facility would be much better. In the future it would be a good idea to reserve space for expansion of the Customs box. Another way to make space for a permanent U.S. Customs facility is to eliminate transient parking. Many other airports are eliminating transient parking and shifting parking needs to FBOs.
- L. Golden: I agree, but some transient parking should be retained to handle the overflow from FBOs.
- T. Ricotta: The terminal building needs to be updated to make it more accommodating. The French Valley Airport is a good example of a terminal building.
- L. Greenberg: If the terminal building is upgraded, the historical features of the building should be retained. It would be good draw for businesses. People like to look at old pictures and visit historical buildings.

Overview of Environmental Baseline Report

J. Duke introduced the Environmental Baseline to the Committee as the evaluation of existing conditions of the SDM 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 and land use. Recommendations for environmental analysis based on the Environmental Baseline were also presented.

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

- L. Rothrock: Could you define socioeconomic and environmental justice or what an impact to those resources would be?
 - An impact would be if one planning alternative had significant negative impacts on a neighborhood of lower socioeconomic status.
- L. Rothrock: Have the resources that will experience no significant impact been verified by a certified professional?

- At this time there are no impacts to the resources. After further analysis we might find there would be significant impacts. When the alternatives are identified, further evaluation would be conducted.
- L. Golden: I do not agree with the categorization of noise in the no significant impact category. I have personal experience with noise and it is a significant issue for the general public. Noise should be considered at potentially significant impact. The Imperial Beach and Ocean View Hills neighborhoods are growing and noise will be an issue for those communities.
- L. Rothrock: How many species were considered in the biological resources?
 - Two plant species and four animal species were considered.
- L. Golden: Are biological studies conducted every year? I know fairy shrimp populations are dependent on weather and the availability of puddles, so study results are different every year. It would be helpful to know the sources used to develop the Environmental Baseline. All the sources of biologists, Metropolitan Airpark and construction studies should be provided to members so we are aware of the data sources that were used.
- L. Golden: As air quality was categorized under potentially significant impacts, both air and land traffic impacts to air quality should be considered. When traffic increases due to increased airport use, there will be greater impacts to air quality.
- L. Golden: There really should be coordination between Metropolitan Airpark to obtain current and accurate information. That is why I think it so important that Metropolitan Airpark provide a presentation or an update to at a future meeting.
- L. Rothrock: I agree, it is hard to develop a Master Plan Update without coordination with Metropolitan Airpark.
- T. Ricotta: The burrowing owl information is inaccurate. The San Diego Zoological Society is a good source to use to study biological resources.
- L. Greenberg: Be aware that there are some source limitations from CEQA studies. For example, Fish and Wildlife Services establishes a season or optimal wheatear conditions when biological studies can be conducted. If a study is conducted during a season without a day of optimal weather, Fish and Wildlife Services will not certify or verify the study.

Master Plan Process Committee Participation Mid-Point Check-in

To evaluate the members' experience on the Advisory Committee, N. Hentschel asked Committee members 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:

- L. Rothrock: The process is fine, it is much more organized than it has been in the past. Although in the Forecast in Aviation Demand there was a 14% to 17% increase in experimental aircrafts, yet I do not see an experimental aircraft pictured in the report. I am here to make sure that experimental aircrafts are represented.
- L. Golden: I had some issues finding this meeting location. The past venues were better. Also, like I mentioned earlier this meeting, I would like to see the data sources used and to clarify where the information is coming from.
- T. Ricotta: The process is good, but you should send a notification with a link to Committee members when the website is updated.

- L. Greenberg: I think the process is good and I always relay the information to the Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce. However, I also would like to have an update from the Metropolitan Airpark to see how that project will fit in with the overall plan of the area. Also, SDM is contiguous to several parts of unincorporated San Diego, so I would like to see representation from those areas.
- G. Ramirez: I think the project team is doing a good job of incorporating the input received at these meetings. I would like to see the outreach be refined a bit more to reach other stakeholders like community residents.

General Questions or Comments

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

- L. Golden: It would be very helpful to change the color scheme of the presentation printout so it more legible.
- L. Rothrock: I understand that some Committee members are not pilots, so I invite everyone to the Experimental Aircraft Association's monthly meeting to see our facilities. The meeting starts at 10 a.m. this Saturday.
- L. Golden: The Esmeralda community HOA should also be notified of these meetings.

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:

- The Public Information Officer from the Richard J. Donovan Correctional facility should attend these meetings. Outreach should be extended to him.
- I am only aware of these Committee meetings because it was announced at the Otay Mesa Recreation Council meeting. My neighbors were not aware of the meetings.
- I live under the flight path and I can say that noise will be an impact. I have heard planes take off between midnight and 2 a.m. The community should have the same rights as the Point Loma community, where the properties have noise insulation and there is a curfew.
- There could be better public notice about these meetings in the news media. Advertisements can be placed in the San Diego Union Tribune. Also, fliers can be distributed to local schools, as many have large bulletin boards where notifications can be posted.

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