



The City of



Airports

FAQs

Montgomery-Gibbs Executive and Brown Field Municipal Airports Master Plans Alternatives Analysis Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

1. What is the Alternatives Analysis?

The alternatives analysis task of the airport master plan is an evaluation of the reasonable options to make the best use of existing airport facilities and any needed development based on aeronautical, financial, and environmental factors. These factors are evaluated to accommodate the forecasted aviation activity and meet the City's strategic vision for the airport.

2. What sources of information do you use to prepare the Alternatives Analysis?

The development of alternatives relies primarily on the content of Working Paper 2 – *Forecast of Aviation Demand* and Working Paper 3 – *Facility Requirements*. This information, in combination with FAA and other industry published guidance, is utilized by the study team to develop alternatives that will help the airport meet current and future aviation demand, and adhere to FAA design standards.

3. What are the methods used to prepare the Alternatives?

Alternatives for each of the master plans are broken down by airside and landside elements. Airside alternatives primarily relate to addressing FAA design standards, existing runway thresholds, and the airfield infrastructure configuration. Landside alternatives look at hangars, the airports' terminals, maintenance structures and other support facilities.

4. How will the Alternatives be evaluated?

Criteria typically used to compare alternatives include capital costs, aviation safety, airspace utilization, ability to address need, environmental impacts, delay and other operational costs, consistency with local plans, and land use availability/compatibility. The following page depicts a sample alternative evaluation. The City of San Diego Airports' alternative evaluation will consider stakeholder feedback and City-specific objectives while adhering to the FAA's guidance. The preferred airside and landside alternatives will be merged into the proposed Airport Layout Plan (ALP).



Sample Alternatives Evaluation

	1: No Action	2: Meeting Standards	3: Instrumentation	4: Within Bounds
2 - Positive 1 - Neutral 0 - Negative				
Comparative Features				
FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY				
Development Costs				
Economic Impact to the Community				
Revenue Generation				
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE				
Capacity				
Capability				
Operational Efficiency				
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS				
Air Quality				
Construction Impacts				
Fish, Wildlife & Plants				
Floodplains				
Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste				
Historic, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources				
Noise				
Land Use Compatibility				
Secondary (induced) Impacts				
Water Quality Management				
Wetlands				
BEST PLANNING TENETS				
Flexibility				
Technically Feasible				
Conforms to the County's goals				
SUMMARY SCORE				
SUMMARY SCORE	17	17	16	18
RANKING				
RANKING	2	2	3	1