Brown Field Municipal Airport Airport Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch Library – Community Room Thursday, January 18, 2018, 3 – 5 p.m.

Advisory Committee Members Present

Clarissa Falcon, Metropolitan Airpark Garret Hollarn, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Larry Rothrock, Brown Field Airport Experimental Aircraft Association Linda Greenberg, Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce 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 Gerardo Ramirez, City Council District 8 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 Anna Marron, Atkins Natalia Hentschel, Katz & Associates Marissa Twite, Katz & Associates

Welcome and Introduction

Wayne Reiter welcomed the Advisory Committee (Committee) to the fourth 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 and Alternative Analysis frequently asked questions document 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 <u>http://www.SDAirportPlans.com/documents/.</u>

Public Meeting Overview

N. Hentschel began the meeting by reviewing the second public meeting for the Brown Field Municipal Airport (SDM) Master Plan that was held on Nov. 16, 2017. The public meeting was held at the Colonel Irving Salomon Community Activity Center. A presentation was provided and attendees had the opportunity to speak with the project team, learn about the current status of the Master Plan and provide comments and feedback during an open house session.

Committee members were asked to provide feedback on the public meeting and share any thoughts or recommendations. The following is feedback regarding the public meeting:

• L. Rothrock: I liked how there was a presentation. I think people are accustomed to being spoken to instead of going to the different stations to speak with the different project team members. Also, everyone was very well prepared.

MAP Presentation

Clarissa Falcon presented on the Metropolitan Airpark (MAP) project to provide Committee members an update on the project's overview, anticipated site location, development phasing and expected impacts.

The Committee asked the following questions:

- L. Golden: What industries do you anticipate bringing in on the north side of the area? I thought there were talks of including a museum in that area.
 - Response from Clarissa: That idea is not necessarily off the table; there is a lot of flexibility in the project. We do anticipate more aviation-related industries to come in, like manufacturing or R&D companies.
- L. Golden: Are there negotiations with Experimental Aircraft Association (EAA) about whether their facilities will remain or be moved?
 - Response from Clarissa: The EAA will be remaining at their current location.

Introduction to Alternatives

Michael Hotaling introduced the draft alternatives for the Master Plan and briefly overviewed the analysis and selection process that will be used to determine the preferred alternative. Five draft landside alternatives and three draft airside alternatives (including the no-action alternative for both categories) were developed based on the Forecast of Aviation Demand and Facility Requirements. Anna Marron and Carly Shannon provided more details on the different options to meet existing and forecasted aviation activity included in the proposed draft airside and landside alternatives.

World Café

N. Hentschel requested that Committee members participate in a World Café discussion activity. Committee members divided into smaller groups and spent 10-minute intervals rotating between different stations dedicated to the landside and airside draft alternatives. A project team member was present at each station to collect feedback and answer questions. Committee members were asked to fill out a comment matrix and were encouraged to draw suggestions on maps depicting the different alternatives. The comments received would help inform the alternatives evaluation process.

At the end of the discussion, N. Hentschel asked project team members to share the feedback received during the World Café. The following is a summary of feedback regarding the landside alternatives:

Alternative #2

- Concerns that hangar area would be too far from the center of the airfield, which would require aircraft to taxi longer before taking off
- Concerns maintenance facilities would be too far from the runway
- General support of a new terminal building
- General support of hangar space located east of the EAA facilities

Alternative #3

- General support to the placement of the hangar area
- Concerns terminal would be located far away from airside
- Suggestions to move terminal facilities closer to the road

Alternative #4

- Suggestions regarding alignment of facilities
- Concerns terminal facility would be too far and would have less frontage to airfield
- Suggestions to move terminal facilities into areas dedicated for hangar space
- General support of U.S Customs' apron area

- General support of the location of maintenance facilities in a non-centralized area
- General support of EAA's location

MAP Alternative

- No significant feedback for the development the City would be responsible for
- Concerns regarding access and configuration of the north side of the airfield

The following is a summary of feedback regarding the airside alternatives:

Alternative #2 and Alternative #3

- Concerns regarding the removal of the pavement as it currently provides a run-up and staging area
- Suggestions to add run-up areas
- Suggestions to add pavement areas near the south side of the airfield

General Questions or Comments

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

- L. Golden: I liked the World Café. I liked that we were able to see all the different alternatives and talk to staff. Everyone was able to provide input.
- L. Rothrock: The EAA facilities could be a good venue for the next public meeting.

Public Comment

At the meeting's closing, N. Hentschel invited members of the public to provide comments. No comments or questions were made.

Next Steps

- The project team will evaluate the draft alternatives based on the comments received and make a recommendation on the preferred alternative to the City.
- Working Paper #5 Alternative Analysis will be published and available in a month.
- Another Committee and public meeting is planned after the publication of Working Paper #5.