

Brown Field Municipal Airport  
Airport Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #5

Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch Library – Community Room  
Wednesday, April 25, 2018, 3 -5 p.m.

**Advisory Committee Members Present**

Garret Hollarn, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority  
Larry Rothrock, Brown Field Airport Experimental Aircraft Association  
Lisa Golden, Otay Mesa Planning Group/Airports Advisory Committee  
Mark Demetris, Brown Field Airport Tower  
Tom Ricotta, San Diego Jet Center/Airports Advisory Committee

**Advisory Committee Members Absent**

Brenda Perez, Federal Aviation Administration Airports District Office  
Clarissa Falcon, Metropolitan Airpark  
Gerardo Ramirez, City Council District 8  
Linda Greenberg, Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce  
Michael Prinz, City of San Diego, Planning Department

**Project Team Members Present**

Wayne Reiter, City of San Diego  
Michael Hotaling, C&S  
Carly Shannon, C&S  
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 Brown Field Municipal Airport (SDM) Master Plan that was held on February 21, 2018. The public meeting was held at the Montgomery-Waller Recreation Center Gymnasium. A presentation was provided, and attendees had the opportunity to speak with the project

team, learn about the Noise and Economic analyses 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 Brown Field alternatives. M. Hotaling introduced Carly Shannon 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 C. Shannon 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?

- L. Golden: The recommended preferred alternative can improve economic viability quite a bit depending on what you do with it. However, there might be some issue with getting pilots to move to the proposed hangar space on the west end. It might be hard to rent out the hangar space because it would be such a long taxi distance down to the west end of the Airport.
- T. Ricotta: The recommended preferred alternative will improve the economic viability of the Airport in the long run, but I do not believe there will be an immediate impact.
- M. Demetris: Brown Field is vastly underutilized space, so any development is a good thing. The question now is if the City builds it, will they come?
- M. Demetris: Economic viability will definitely increase if an FBO comes to Brown Field.
- G. Hollarn: Increasing hangar availability will increase the economic viability of the Airport as there will be more opportunities for pilots to lease space. The only unknown factor is what will happen with the Metropolitan Airpark (MAP).

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?

- L. Golden: The location of hangars will increase taxi time, which can lead to a negative economic impact to pilots. Also, the removal of pavement takes away from the operational and performance efficiency.
- M. Demetris: The new taxiway at the end of the runway allows for aircrafts to get out of the way sooner.

- G. Hollarn: The recommended preferred alternative certainly cleans things up and modifies the Airport to meet the correct standards.
- L. Golden: The recommended preferred alternative changes the turn where Taxiway C meets Taxiway A to a 90-degree angle. I believe the project team said that change is to meet a FAA design standard, but I have never heard of that standard.
  - That is correct, that change is identified to meet FAA design standards. The FAA does not want an aircraft to be able to move from an apron straight to a runway. The preferred alternative will not receive FAA approval if that change is not made.
- M. Demetris: Tower operations would prefer to see an additional EAA taxiway connector as shown on the recommended preferred alternative.
- L. Golden: The Seahawks from Navy operations have a tendency to get in the way of civilian pilots. That is why we need the additional pavement, to maneuver around aircrafts on busy days.

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

- L. Golden: Noise and pollution is a concern, especially at the west end where the proposed hangar space is located.
- L. Rothrock: It is not clear, is the preferred alternative proposing to put another exit near Alpha?
  - There will be additional taxiway access within the MAP constraints.
- M. Demetris: Runway 8 can be an exit for pilots, but I would not be able to get pilots to pull right into that area. If I can get pilots to taxi right into Taxiway A, then the Tower would be able to see clearly.
- L. Rothrock: If the MAP development does not go through, there will be concerns about vernal pools. MAP will mitigate impacts to those pools, but if the development does not go through that responsibility will fall to the City.

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

- L. Rothrock: The recommended preferred alternative allows for a lot of flexibility in the space that would have been designated to MAP development. It is good approach if MAP is not approved.
- T. Ricotta: It might be a financial issue to tear down the terminal. It is a good idea to expand and revamp the terminal facility, but it could be expensive to demolish and replace the facility. There are many military airports that have beautiful terminal facilities they renewed instead of tearing them down.
- L. Golden: Renewing the terminal facilities would preserve the historical status of the terminal.

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

- L. Rothrock: The best part about Brown Field is the long runway.

- L. Golden: The recommended preferred alternative does not change much regarding the General Aviation (GA) pilot experience. It does provide extra maneuvering room, but I am still pro-concrete because it does allow for even more maneuvering room.
- L. Rothrock: It is nice that the west end of the runway allows pilots to land closer to fuel. Also, there are bathrooms closer to the landing area.

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

- The Committee all agreed that the recommended preferred alternative is possible within the existing Airport constraints.

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

- The Committee all agreed the recommended preferred alternative represents a balance of all factors.
- L. Rothrock: Jets, helicopters and small planes all have their separate space and the recommended preferred alternative allows different aircraft to do runups without effecting others.

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

- L. Golden: I would prefer if the proposed hangar space was not located at the far west end. As a pilot it will cost me a fortune to taxi all the way to the west end and as a homeowner, the last thing I would want to hear is plane engines revving up. I would recommend spreading the hangar space out so they are not all concentrated in one area.
  - The proposed MAP development includes more centrally located hangar storage.
- L. Golden: Why is the FAA concerned with the additional pavement near the runway? It is not a good idea to remove any pavement. On a busy day, additional pavement allows for more room for pilots to navigate and maneuver.
  - It is a design standards issue, as it may cause pilot confusion. The FAA requires this arrangement in their Advisory Circular guidance.
- L. Golden: It is also not a good idea to replace the cement between the taxiways with grass or gravel. I have never seen that at other airports, as those materials can cause damage to a plane.
- L. Rothrock: It is never a good idea to remove pavement from a pilot's perspective. There could be instances when a pilot has difficulty landing and needs additional space, or a pilot has engine problems. Removing pavement is always bad, and adding gravel is worse.
- M. Demetris: Perhaps a happy medium can be reached. The concrete between the two taxiways can be painted green instead of being replaced with grass. Then there would still be "grass" in the middle of the two taxiways, but pilots would still have a hard surface if additional space is necessary.

- T. Ricotta: The Customs Facility should be shown with more detail and the recommended preferred alternative should accurately reflect the Customs Facility as proposed.

### **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 can 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. No public comments were provided.

### **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.