

Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport  
Airport Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #5

City of San Diego Public Utilities Department Metropolitan Operations Complex II  
Tuesday, April 24, 2018, 3 - 5 p.m.

**Advisory Committee Members Present**

Bob Basso, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant  
Chris Sluka, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Flight School  
Dave Gordon, Plus One Flyers/Marigold/NAC Tenant  
Dave Ryan, Crownair/Airports Advisory Committee  
Garret Hollarn, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority  
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

**Advisory Committee Members Absent**

Al Boyce, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant  
Brenda Perez, Federal Aviation Administration Airport District Office  
Chuck McGill, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant/Airports Advisory Committee  
Heather Dagle, Flattop/Marigold  
Henry Sickels, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant  
Tom Dray, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tower

**Project Team Members Present**

Wayne Reiter, City of San Diego  
Michael Hotaling, C&S  
Jake Shurer, C&S  
Anna Marron, Atkins  
Lori Steiner, Atkins  
Natalia Hentschel, Katz & Associates  
Marissa Twite, Katz & Associates

**Welcome and Introduction**

Wayne Reiter welcomed the Advisory Committee (Committee) to the fifth and final meeting and thanked them for their participation. Natalia Hentschel then introduced her role as facilitator and briefly summarized the meeting's agenda.

Committee members received the meeting agenda, the Advisory Committee feedback survey, a copy of the Alternatives Evaluation Summary and a schematic of the recommended preferred alternative to place in the binders provided at the first meeting.

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

### **Public Meeting Summary**

N. Hentschel began the meeting by providing an overview of the third public meeting for the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport (MYF) Master Plan that was held on February 20, 2018. The public meeting was held at the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department Metropolitan Operations Complex II Auditorium. A presentation was provided, and attendees had the opportunity to speak with the project team, learn about the Noise and Economic analysis and provide comments on the draft alternatives during an open house session.

### **Review of Alternatives and Recommended Preferred Alternative**

Michael Hotaling provided a brief update on the current status of the Master Plan and reviewed the analysis process used to develop the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport alternatives. M. Hotaling introduced Jake Shurer and Anna Marron to summarize the draft landside and airside alternatives and to present the project team's recommended preferred alternative that will be considered by the City of San Diego. The recommended preferred alternative was developed by combining the favored features of the different draft alternatives based on the feedback received from the Committee and public, and evaluated based on financial feasibility, operational performance, environmental implications and best planning tenets.

After J. Shurer and A. Marron presented the recommended preferred alternative, N. Hentschel requested the Committee provide feedback based on a series of seven discussion questions. The following are comments and questions regarding the recommended preferred alternative, organized by discussion question:

How do you see the recommended preferred alternative contributing to the economic viability of the Airport and the economic vitality of the City?

- T. Reid: The recommended preferred alternative will be very helpful as it provides more opportunities for lighter aircraft and does not squeeze small businesses out. The only concern would be if an FBO takes over.
- D. Gordon: The layout does provide more tie-downs for small aircraft. However, development phasing has to be carefully done. If the airport is shut down to accommodate development, it will be disastrous for small businesses. Also, if an FBO does come in, it would have to happen before development begins.
- J. Pointon: The main concerns of the surrounding community are noise and security. If there is an increase in noise, there will be a negative impact when it comes to economic vitality of the neighboring community. I think there should be more detailed information on the noise impacts of the recommended preferred alternatives to real estate. There could be impacts to property values and investments.
- T. Reid: There are some residents who enjoy living close to an airport, they may even equal the number of people who do not. I do not believe the supply/demand of real estate will change much with the recommended preferred alternative.

- J. Pointon: The concerns are an increase in noise and a decrease in security. The proposal should address those concerns specifically as well as the economic impacts.
- D. Gordon: Noise impacts to surrounding communities are valid concerns. My opinion is that we will not see a dramatic increase in noise as the fleet is not changing significantly nor will there be an increase in take-offs.
- S. Hasson: The increase in available parking and tie-downs will drive the economic viability of the airport.
- C. Sulka: The recommended preferred alternative will increase operations. Many pilots do not come to Montgomery-Gibbs because the landing distance is too short but, with the layout of the recommended preferred alternative, operations should increase which will lead to higher economic vitality.
- D. Gordon: There will be a trickle-down effect to the support services and peripheral businesses, such as restaurants near the airport. That also should be a consideration when development begins: the impacts to the surrounding businesses.

Based on the information presented, in what ways do you see the recommended preferred alternative maintaining, enhancing or detracting from the operational efficiency and the performance of the Airport?

- D. Gordon: There is an issue with the new runup area for 28L. With the recommended preferred alternative, pilots will have to cross (taxiway) Hotel interact with traffic. It would be better if the runup was placed north of (taxiway) Hotel.
- T. Reid: I also have concerns about the runup area for 28L - it is too close to the helicopter landing area and the hangars. It is not safe for a runup area to be that close to hangars.
- D. Gordon: Also, the proposed runup area is six times bigger than it needs to be, the area can be reduced.
- S. Hansson: The demolition of or taxiway C is problematic, especially since Runway 23 is very active. The demolition of taxiway C will cause operational issues for the tower.
- T. Reid: What is the value of eliminating taxiway C?
  - o It was removed from the recommended preferred alternative mainly because it could be used for development. That open area would also allow for the alignment to be straightened.
- S. Hasson: The taxiway is already constructed, it is hard to see the value of removing taxiway C as it does not actually allow for much development.
- D. Gordon: Removing taxiway M is also concerning.
  - o Taxiway M was removed to meet FAA design standards.

What are the environmental concerns that you have about the recommended preferred alternative?

- J. Pointon: Could the project team clarify the environmental concerns the Committee should be considering?
  - o Environmental concerns would be if the location and construction of infrastructure would have any adverse effects to the surrounding environment.

- J. Pointon: There should be an accurate evaluation of the mix of aircraft and their associated use of fuel to understand the corresponding air and noise impacts.

Does this alternative allow for the flexibility to respond to unforeseen changes and why?

- S. Hasson: The elimination of Runway 5 should not be included in the recommended preferred alternative. I would hate to see the runway taken away. If it will be eliminated, then there has to be a good development reason in mind. Pilots do not like to see runways taken away since pavement is hard to recover once it is eliminated.
- D. Ryan: Does the Spiders Aircraft Services have a dedicated, carved out area?
  - o To conserve the historic value, the facility been preserved.
- R. Badilla: The Spiders Aircraft Services can be relocated to allow for better use of airport space.
- J. Pointon: The recommended preferred alternative should take into account unforeseen changes and consider increases in security. There are concerns of a remote terminal as it is less secure; it should be adjacent to the perimeter fence. More security is better than less.
- T. Reid: An access code is required to enter through the perimeter fence, and management is religious about updating the code to maintain security.
  - o Security is a concern, but there has to be a balance with access to a public facility.
- D. Gordon: There is a perception that it is easy for an individual to steal a plane, but it is important to maintain a balanced perspective. Security is important, but so is maintaining public access.

Is this alternative possible within the existing constraints of the Airport?

- S. Hasson: The project team should ensure the enterprise fund to develop the recommended preferred alternative is sufficient. The terminal expansion and other developments are necessary to meet the City's goals, but it needs to be financially feasible. Will developments be covered by federal funds?
  - o One of the next steps of the Mater Plan process is to conduct a detailed financial analysis to determine feasibility.

Does this alternative provide a more attractive experience for General Aviation pilots?

- D. Gordon: The recommended preferred alternative could be very attractive if the development is done in the right order. It is important to ensure that small business tenants are not pushed out. It also necessary to see the future plans for the existing leases.
- J. Ander: It seems like an additional 6,000 feet will be added to the terminal, but the preferred alternative does not detail what will be included in the new facility or how the new developments will fit in with the existing terminal services. For instance, how will the restaurant fit into the developments?

- At this stage in the Master Plan process, that level of detail is still unknown. Additional space is needed, as well as continued maintenance of existing facilities.
- S. Hasson: Airports across the country are heading in this direction: a terminal facility with amenities such as a pilot lounge or bunk rooms. Aviation is heading in this direction.
- D. Ryan: The recommended preferred alternative will add 53 tie-downs, how many tie-downs are there currently?
  - Currently there are approximately 20-30 tie-downs.

Does this alternative represent a balance of the factors previously discussed?

- The Committee all agreed the recommended preferred alternative represents a balance of all factors.

The following are general comments and questions regarding the recommended preferred alternative, not related to the discussion questions:

- J. Pointon: The recommended preferred alternative is basically a combination of draft alternatives 1 and 2, with some additional changes. Will this be the version that will be recommended to the City of San Diego?
  - Yes, that is correct.
- B. Basso: The change in the displaced threshold does not allow for larger aircraft but increases safety for landings. There is a perception that bigger runways mean an airport will attract bigger planes. That is not the case, a larger runway makes landings safer. Most aircraft are limited by take-off distance, not landing distance.
- J. Pointon: If the displaced threshold does not increase the number of large aircraft, would there be an increase in the frequency in take-offs?
  - There are a lot of factors, such as fleet mix, that determine if there will be an increase in take-offs.
- B. Basso: Palomar Airport is an all-executive, FBO airport. Palomar would be the preferred airport for most corporate jets.
- T. Reid: Also most corporate jets would also prefer Palomar Airport because there is a lot more pilot amenities and offers a more corporate environment.
- J. Pointon: To clarify, do you mean the displaced threshold does not necessarily make Montgomery-Gibbs more attractive, as terminal services and amenities are more attractive to pilots? But, would there still be an expected increase in jets taking-off at Montgomery-Gibbs?
  - An increase can be expected, but a drastic increase is not expected.
- C. Sulka: With a runway extension, there will be jets. Although I do not think a big increase is expected as there are weather limitations.
- T. Reid: In a previous meeting, the projected airport usage was presented to the Committee. The projection showed very little increase in usage over the next 20 years. General aviation is decreasing, so the overall number of take-offs and landings will experience a very modest growth.
- S. Hasson: What is the difference between the noise generated by a jet and a Beechcraft? Beechcraft planes are louder aircraft, louder than even some jets.

- If the recommended preferred alternative is approved by the City, a noise study as part of the Environmental Impact Report will be conducted. The study will analyze the possible noise impacts of the different aircraft in the anticipated fleet mix.
- J. Pointon: The noise impacts are rated as neutral for draft alternatives 1 and 2, should we expect the same from the preferred alternative?
  - With existing aircraft traffic, the noise levels were measured at 65 DNL. With the relocated threshold, the noise impacts still did not leave the Airport property.
- J. Pointon: It would be useful if the information presented could be translated to layman's terms.
- S. Hasson: The public viewing area seems too small. My suggestion is to use the Van Nuys and Scottsdale airports as examples. The purpose of the viewing area is to increase public visibility of the Airport, but the proposed location is next to a busy freeway interchange and is too far away.
- S. Hasson: There was a lot of comments regarding security concerns, especially from the community. Security concerns should be added to the Airports Advisory Committee's agenda. It is something the Airports Advisory Committee should discuss since, as pilots, we are not seeing the same issues that are causing community concern.
- J. Pointon: Is this meeting the last opportunity for us to provide comments?
  - There will be public comment periods during the CEQA process. Community members can submit feedback during those periods.

### **PAC Feedback and Recognition**

N. Hentschel presented the Committee with a feedback survey and requested members complete the survey to inform the project team how the Committee process could be improved.

Additionally, to thank the Committee members for their time and dedication to the Master Plan process, W. Reiter presented a Certificate of Appreciation to each member. The Certificate of Appreciation recognized the Committee members dedication to serving as a community representative and to informing the Master Plan.

### **Public Comment**

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

- I am resident of Del Cerro, and my property overlooks Runway 28R. If the threshold is extended, allowing aircraft to do visual approaches, planes will be approaching the Airport 61 feet lower than the glide slope. Aircraft can be flying as low as 500 to 600 feet above our heads. It will definitely be a noise annoyance to say the least. Recently, there was twin turbine aircraft attempting to do a visual approach but had to execute a go-around. It was very loud, that sort of activity will not be welcomed by the surrounding community. My recommendation is to have aircraft cross Penny (waypoint) at 2,500 feet and use the glide slope to make a visual approach. Pilots can

- do that very quietly and efficiently. At some point during this process, the adverse noise effects caused by aircraft doing visual approaches need to be studied.
- I live under the glide slope for Runway 28. In the past, I raised questions about helicopter activity, I am pleased to say it has been much quieter recently. Is the tower a 24-hour operation currently and will it ever be in the future?
    - o The tower is not a 24-hour operation and will not likely be 24-hour operation in the future.
  - Recently there were failures of aircraft at take-off and I raised the question with the safety board that they need to investigate if it is a fuel problem. I have not received a reply or heard if anyone has any input on what causes the failures.
    - o The investigations are still underway, only preliminary reports have been released. It usually takes up to two years for the full investigation.
  - In the past six months, lower elevation flights have been passing over Allied Gardens at night. Records of the time, date and aircraft are being collected.
  - Has the project team selected who will be conducting the Environmental Impact Report?
    - o Helix Environmental Planning has been selected.
  - Are the comments provided during this meeting being noted? People are discussing noise and security and those issues will have impacts on the final report. Also, I did not hear comments about what will be happening to the land on the east side of the airport because I know there are plants and other possible environmental impacts. I just wanted to ensure all of this is taken into consideration in the report.
    - o There are minutes being taken during the meeting and they will be posted online. Environmental impacts will be studied during the CEQA process.
  - I live in Serra Mesa and I share the same concerns as J. Pointon about security and noise. I am especially concerned about security, because there are six to seven schools near the airport. As far as noise, the current noise levels are unacceptable. It does not seem to make a difference if I complain or not. If the noise levels are going to increase, the residents will be upset.
  - I am a member of the Cubberley Elementary PTA. Threats from the air are a school safety concern.

### Next Steps

M. Hotaling closed the meeting by summarizing the final steps in the Master Plan process. The final steps include the City selecting their preferred alternative, the development of a Capital Improvement and Financing Plan, ALP Development and conducting a CEQA analysis.