

Airport Master Plan for Montgomery-Gibbs **Executive Airport** PAC Meeting #5







SD Airports



>Introductions Final Public Meeting Overview >Review of Alternatives >Airside >Landside Recommended Preferred Alternative >Public Comment Next Steps





1. Final Public Meeting Overview







Final Public Meeting Overview

>Feb. 20, 2018 >Public Utilities Dept. MOC II Auditorium

>Notices Included: Project website post >Email to contact database >Email to selected officials (Peters, Sherman, Cate, Zapf, Bry) >Print ads, web ads, and online community calendar posts Nextdoor posts







Final Public Meeting Overview

Meeting format: Presentation and Information Stations

- Information presented:
 - Master Plan Overview and Schedule Update
 - Noise Overview
 - >Economic Overview
 - Introduction to Draft Airside Alternatives
 - Introduction to Draft Landside Alternatives
- >Attendance: 18 (signed-in)

>Meeting materials and public comments available for review on the project website



http://www.sdairportplans.com/





2. Review of Alternatives







Spring 2017

Existing Conditions Analysis

Forecasting & Facility Requirements

ALP – Airport Layout Plan CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act FFA – Financial Feasibility Analysis







Master Plan Adoption & ALP Approval

here

Summer 2018

Aternatives Analysis





•Identifies best options to meet existing and forecast aviation activity

•Working Papers 2 and 3 – Forecast of Aviation Demand and Facility Requirements



Airside vs. Landside





Airside

Landside







Airside Alternatives





Alternative #1 – No Action









DRAFT Alternative #2









SD) Airports

Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Master Plan

Figure Alternative 2

Legend

- Property Line

Existing Buildings

Existing Airfield Pavement

Proposed Airfield Pavement



Proposed Demolition



Proposed Segmented Circle





DRAFT Alternative #3











Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Master Plan

Figure Alternative 3

Legend

- Property Line

Existing Buildings



Proposed Airfield Pavement





Proposed Segmented Circle



RPZ — RPZ — Existing RPZ

- RPZ - Proposed RPZ





DRAFT Alternative #4











Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Master Plan

Figure Alternative 4

Legend

- Property Line

Existing Buildings



Proposed Airfield Pavement



Proposed Demolition





ATKINS Member of the SNC-Lavalin Group

Landside Alternatives







Alternative #1 – No Action









DRAFT Alternative #2











Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Master Plan

Figure 5.X Alternative 2 -**Smooth Transition**

Legend

Property Line -

Existing Buildings

Proposed Buildings





Proposed Airfield Pavement



Proposed Aircraft Tie-Downs TTTTT



Proposed Wash Rack





DRAFT Alternative #3











Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Master Plan

Figure 5.X Alternative 3 -Reconfiguration

Legend

Property Line

Existing Buildings

Proposed Buildings



Existing Airfield Pavement



Proposed Airfield Pavement

Corporate Helicopters Right of First Refusal Proposed Taxiway/Taxilane Centerline



Proposed Wash Rack

Proposed Aircraft Tie-Downs





DRAFT Alternative #4











Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Master Plan

Figure 5.X Alternative 4 -**Fresh Perspective**

Legend

Property Line

Existing Buildings

Proposed Buildings



177

TTTT

Existing Airfield Pavement

Proposed Airfield Pavement

Corporate Helicopters Right of First Refusal Proposed Taxiway/Taxilane Centerline

Proposed Aircraft Tie-Downs

Proposed Wash Rack

Potential Fuel Island **Location Options**







Evaluation Criteria

Financial Feasibility >Operational Performance >Environmental Implications Best Planning Tenets





Airside Evaluation

Table 5.7 – Airside Alternatives Evaluation Summary Airside Alternatives

 -1 : Negative 0 : Neutral +1 : Positive 		V
Financial Fascibility	Comparative	Features
Financial Feasibility		\bigcirc
Development Costs		\bigcirc
Job Creation		
Financial Sustainability		
Operational Performance		
Capacity		
Capability	\bigcirc	
Operational Efficiency	\bigcirc	
Environmental Implications		
Air Quality		
Biological Resources (Including Fish, Wildlife, and Plants		
Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention	Ŏ	Ŏ
Land Use		
Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use		
Climate		
Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f		
Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources		
Visual Effects (Including Light Emission ⁽		
Water Resources (Including Wetlands, Floodplains, Surface Waters, Groundwater, and Wild and Scenic Rivers		





Table 5.7 – Airside Alternatives Evaluation Summary Airside Alternatives

 -1 : Negative 0 : Neutral +1 : Positive 	Alternative 1: Alternative 1:
	Comparative
Best Planning Tenets	
Flexibility	
Technically Feasible	
Conforms to the City s Goals	\bigcirc
	Summary
Summary Score	-2
	Ranki
Ranking	4





Landside Evaluation

Table 5.8 – Landside Alternatives Evaluation Summary Landside Alternatives

 -1 : Negative 0 : Neutral +1 : Positive 	Alternative 1: Alternative 1: Alternative Action Comparative	2
Financial Feasibility		
Development Costs		\bigcirc
Job Creation		
Financial Sustainability	0	
Operational Performance		
Capacity	\bigcirc	
Capability	\bigcirc	
Operational Efficiency		
Environmental Implications		
Air Quality		\bigcirc
Biological Resources (Including Fish, Wildlife, and Plants		\bigcirc
Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention		
Land Use		
Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use		
Climate		\bigcirc
Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f		
Historical, Architectural, Archeological, and Cultural Resources		
Visual Effects (Including Light Emission ⁽		
Water Resources (Including Wetlands, Floodplains, Surface Waters, Groundwater, and Wild and Scenic Rivers		\bigcirc





Table 5.8 – Landside Alternatives Evaluation Summary Landside Alternatives

 -1 : Negative 0 : Neutral +1: Positive 	Alternative 1: Alternative 1:
	Comparative
Best Planning Tenets	
Flexibility	\bigcirc
Technically Feasible	
Conforms to the City s Goals	\bigcirc
	Summary
Summary Score	-4
	Ranki
Ranking	4







3. Recommended Preferred Alternative





Recommended Preferred Alternative













Recommended Preferred Alternative







Non-Precision Runway Markings

6

H

53 Tie-downs and **Designated Area for Corporate Aircraft**

1 March 1



C







Recommended Preferred Alternative











Feedback



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





>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?





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





constraints of the Airport?

experience for GA pilots?



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

- >Is this alternative possible within the existing
- >Does this alternative provide a more attractive



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





PAC Feedback Survey and Recognition









4. Public Comment







5. Next Steps



Next Steps

Preferred Alternative





Capital Improvement and Financing Plan

ALP Development

CEQA

