

Montgomery –Gibbs Executive Airport  
Airport Master Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #4

City of San Diego Public Utilities Department Metropolitan Operations Complex II  
Tuesday, January 16, 2018 – 3 – 5 p.m.

**Advisory Committee Members Present**

Al Boyce, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant  
Chuck McGill, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant/Airports Advisory Committee  
Dave Gordon, Plus One Flyers/Marigold/NAC Tenant  
Dave Ryan, Crownair/Airports Advisory Committee  
Garret Hollarn, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority  
Henry Sickels, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant  
Jackie Ander, Serra Mesa Town Council/Airports Advisory Committee  
Joel Pointon, Clairemont Town Council  
Lisa Lind, City of San Diego, Planning Department  
Scott Hasson, Tierrasanta Town Council/Airports Advisory Committee  
Tom Reid, Plus One Flyers/Airports Advisory Committee

**Advisory Committee Members Absent**

Bob Basso, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tenant  
Brenda Perez, Federal Aviation Administration Airport District Office  
Chris Sluka, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Flight School  
Heather Dagle, Flattop/Marigold  
Robyn Badilla, Kearny Mesa Planning Group  
Tom Dray, Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport Tower

**Project Team Members Present**

Wayne Reiter, City of San Diego  
Michael Hotaling, C&S  
Sasha Schultz, C&S  
Jake Shurer, 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 <http://www.SDAirportPlans.com/documents/>.

**Public Meeting Overview**

N. Hentschel began the meeting by reviewing the second public meeting for the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport (MYF) Master Plan that was held on Nov. 15, 2017. The public meeting was held at the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department's Metropolitan Operations Complex II. 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 and questions regarding the public meeting:

- G. Hollarn: I liked the format of having the presentation first then breaking down into individual information stations.
- D. Gordon: There were only a handful of attendees, which I think is a good thing because it means there were no controversial items. For the most part, residents do not get involved unless there is a controversial issue. Also, I think Nextdoor.com was a great way to notify the community of the public meeting.
- J. Pointon: When the public meeting was posted to Nextdoor.com, did the City monitor the comments?
  - The public meeting was posted to Nextdoor.com by the City of San Diego's Communication Department. W. Reiter will follow up with them to determine how comments were monitored.

### **Staffing Update**

Michael Hotaling notified Committee members that Ralph Redman, the Project Deputy on the team, recently joined the San Diego County Airport Authority and will no longer be a part of the project team for the MYF Master Plan.

### **Introduction to Alternatives**

M. 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. Three draft airside and three draft landside alternatives (including the no-action alternative for both categories) were developed based on the Forecast of Aviation Demand and Facility Requirements. Anna Marron and Jake Shurer provided more details on the different components 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 ten 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 placement of wash racks would create sewage and drainage issues
- Concerns tie downs were placed too close to corporate helicopter area
- Concerns regarding the loss of vehicle parking due to terminal expansion
- Concerns that there would be no pedestrian access to the expanded terminal area
- Requests to maximize aeronautical uses of airport

#### Alternative #3

- Requests for more space dedicated to parking
- Possible future security concerns while upgrades to the facilities are being implemented
- Suggestions to locate terminal facilities closer to the transient parking area
- Concerns regarding land use designation of the area north of Aero Drive

#### Alternative #4

- Concerns regarding location of terminal facilities
- Concerns aircraft parking would not be able to accommodate future airport use
- General support for eliminating pavement of Runway 5 to create development opportunities in the western area of the airport
- Concerns regarding the location of hangars due to environmental and terrain constraints
- Concerns the location of the viewing area would not provide the best view

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

#### Alternative #2

- Desire to relocate run-up area from its proposed location
- Concerns about the need for delta removal
- Requests to increase the runway taxi area

#### Alternative #3

- Mixed support for the relocation of Runway 5 as it would allow for more development opportunities but would reduce take off distance
- Input for reduction of displaced threshold area

#### Alternative #4

- Little to no support of Alternative #4 due to its impacts on operations

### General Questions or Comments

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

- J. Pointon: There was also a comment about Alternative #3 and the proposed demolition of the segment of Taxiway C north of Runway 10L-28R; what is the purpose or rationale of removing that area if it still serves its purpose?
  - That comment is reflected in the mixed support for the relocation of runway 5.
- J. Pointon: Can the Committee receive prior notification of when the public meeting will be held?
  - We are in the process of venue selection, but once a date is established, the Committee will be notified.

### Public Comments

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

- I did not see Tierrasanta listed as one of the communities notified via Nextdoor.com
  - W. Reiter will follow up with the City of San Diego's Communication Department to verify Tierrasanta was included.
- I am a resident of the Del Cerro community. My property overlooks the airport and, with the current configurations, a fair amount of aircraft traffic making visual approaches pass over my house. Ninety percent of the aircraft traffic is benign, but there are times when it is quite loud. My concern is with the elimination of the displaced threshold of 28 Right. I understand the operational desirability of that as it will enhance the capacity of the airport. However, the elimination of the displaced threshold of 28 Right would bring heavier aircrafts to a lower glide slope by about 62 feet, which does not seem like a lot,

but it is quite impactful to noise levels. I can easily see these heavier aircrafts coming in for a visual approach to a runway that is closer to me, creating a noise problem which does not currently exist. We have a very happy situation in Del Cerro right now. My recommendation is a compromise: eliminate the displaced threshold, but have the heavier aircraft stay on the localizer and the glide slope, and do a straight in approach. That would not generate a noise problem.

- What is the expected increase in capacity of the airfield once it is enlarged?
  - From an airside standpoint, a lot of the proposed improvements address safety concerns and do not necessarily increase capacity.
- How many additional hangars have been proposed?
  - The Facility Requirements called for about 25 additional hangars.
- What is the expected increase in capacity of flight schools?
  - We do not anticipate an increase in the capacity of flight schools. You might see the foot print of flight school facilities increase as they build out and expand, but you will not necessarily see more schools.
- I believe in the 1980s when the Class B Airspace was created, it moved traffic from Gillespie Field to Avocado Hills, just east of Gillespie. I believe the Navy increased the GCA angle to minimize the noise from their approaching aircrafts. I would suggest having the glide slope somewhere in that range to help mitigate the noise impacts.
- Is it possible to have a higher glide slope? A typical glide slope is about 3%, but there can be a glide slope of 3.5% like Lindbergh Field.
- There is a looming pilot shortage. Any upgrades to the facilities and training programs need to be made to mitigate the loss of pilots.
- There has been a lot of discussion of glide slopes, approach angles and other matters, but what about the helicopters? I have never had problems with airplane noise, but helicopters are an ongoing issue in my area.
  - Changes to helicopter routes are not addressed in the Master Plan; however, they must not interfere with airplane operations. This is because airplanes are more constrained to runways.
- I live in Tierrasanta and in the last six to eight months the noise levels have increased. There has been an increase in low flying airplanes and helicopters. I am not sure if that is because the airplanes are changing the way they come into the airport. I am concerned about the noise and air pollution. That is why I am in here today, I want to ensure a proper noise and air pollution study is done to address those issues.
  - In the next phase of the Master Plan process, a noise expert will be developing a noise profile on the current conditions of the airfield so insight into changes in noise levels can be analyzed. The expert will be present at the next Committee and public meetings. You will be able to ask them questions and gain insight into the different details.
- The start time of this meeting was problematic for community members, especially for those who work. The meeting start time should be after 5:30 p.m., like the meeting that was held in November.
  - This meeting starts at 3 p.m. because this is the Advisory Committee meeting. The meeting in November was a general public meeting and started at a later time to accommodate working schedules. However, Committee meetings are open to the public.

### 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.